

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, October 10, 1986

The House met at 10 a.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our best thoughts, O God, hope for a day when people will know security in their lives and in the depths of our hearts we yearn for peace. As the leaders of our world meet to find the ways of understanding, we ask Your blessing upon them and we earnestly pray that Your good word of grace and Your benediction of peace will mark their meetings. Even as we pray for the leaders of the nations, may each of us seek to do Your will that justice will roll down as waters and righteousness like an ever flowing stream. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary be directed to communicate to the President of the United States and to the House of Representatives the order and judgment of the Senate in the case of Harry E. Claiborne and transmit a certified copy of same to each.

The message also announced that the Senate having tried Harry E. Claiborne, U.S. district judge for the district of Nevada, upon four Articles of Impeachment exhibited against him by the House of Representatives, and two-thirds of the Senators present having found him guilty of the charges contained in the First, Second, and Fourth Articles of Impeachment: It is therefore,

Ordered and adjudged, That the said Harry E. Claiborne be, and he is hereby removed from office.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, joint resolution, and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2067. An act to validate conveyances of certain lands in the State of California that form part of the right-of-way granted by the United States to the Central Pacific Railway Company;

H.R. 2921. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permanent easements for water conveyance systems in order to resolve title claims arising under

Acts repealed by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3352. An act to transfer certain real property to the City of Mesquite, NV;

H.R. 5496. An act to designate certain National Forest System lands in the State of Georgia to the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 735. Joint resolution to designate December 11, 1986, as "National SEEK and College Discovery Day"; and

H. Con. Res. 391. Concurrent resolution calling on the Governments of the Soviet Union, Poland, and Czechoslovakia to cease activities causing harmful interference to the broadcasts of Voice of America and RFE/RL, Incorporated.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3838) "An act to reform the internal revenue laws of the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 593) "An act for the relief of the Merchants National Bank of Mobile, Alabama."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1082) "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas-Mississippi Great River Bridge Construction Compact."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2032) "An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide improved protection for investors in the Government securities market, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2506) "An act to establish a Great Basin National Park in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 565) "An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey, without consideration, to the Town of Payson, Arizona, approximately 30.96 acres of Forest Service lands," with an amendment.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 511. An act to change the name of the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, Florida, to the Arthur R. Marshall Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge;

S. 786. An act to establish an Information Age Commission;

S. 1209. An act to establish the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality;

S. 2266. An act to establish a ski area permit system on national forest lands, and for other purposes;

S. 2370. An act to authorize the Francis Scott Key Park Foundation, Inc., to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia;

S. 2852. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the Peninsula Airport Commission, Virginia, for airport purposes;

S. 2890. An act to designate the United States Courthouse for the Eastern District of Virginia in Alexandria, Virginia, as the "Albert V. Bryan United States Courthouse";

S. 2914. An act to extend through fiscal year 1988 SBA Pilot Programs under section 8 of the Small Business Act;

S.J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to designate March 17, 1987, as "National China-Burma-India Veterans Association Day"; and

S.J. Res. 407. Joint resolution designating November 12, 1986, as "Salute to School Volunteers Day."

The message also announced that pursuant to Executive Order 12131 of May 4, 1979, as extended by Executive Order 12551 of February 21, 1986, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President appoints Mr. Andrews, to the President's Export Council.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 301(b)(1)(D) of Public Law 99-371, the President pro tempore appoints Dr. Frank Bowe, of New York, from private life, and Peter B. Greenough, of New York, from private life, to the Commission on Education of the Deaf.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 584) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 584

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Armed Services: Representative HILLIS of Indiana, (to rank below Mrs. HOLT);

Committee on Education and Labor: Representative DORNAN of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ICELAND AND HUMAN RIGHTS

(Mrs. COLLINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the meeting in Iceland between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev is successful. While the two leaders debate the technical issue of arms control, however, it is important that they not forget the human issue of justice.

Eleven years ago, the Soviet Union signed the Helsinki accords and agreed to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief. Since that time, Moscow has engaged in numerous violations of Helsinki—including the political abuse of psychiatry, legal restrictions on organized religious life, the repression of the cultural heritage of Jews and other minorities, the denial of family reunification, and the closing of contacts between Soviet citizens and the outside world.

Mr. Speaker, if arms control is to work, if world peace is to be a reality—Moscow must adhere to the basic human rights outlined in the Helsinki accords. If Mr. Gorbachev wants to reform his nation, as he says he does, he must stop persecuting those who exercise their religious beliefs.

All Americans are deeply concerned with human rights. Freedom and justice are the ideals on which our Nation is based and abuses of these rights deeply offend our principles. As a freedom loving people, we know that human rights provide a solid foundation for international treaties.

To make this clear, I am introducing a resolution, expressing the sense of the Congress that, in his upcoming meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev, the President should insist that the Soviet Union safeguard the human rights of its citizens, allow additional Jewish emigration, and protect cultural and religious rights within its borders.

This resolution sends an important message to the Soviets. It demonstrates America's longstanding commitment to human rights. And it will show Mr. Gorbachev what the American Congress already knows, that world peace will only be possible when world justice is a reality.

THE CONGRESS WANTS JUSTICE FOR MR. IVEZAJ: IS YUGOSLAVIA LISTENING?

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, congressional and diplomatic pressure is building on Yugoslavia to release Mr. Peter Ivezaj, the Michigan resi-

dent who received a long jail term in that country. I hope that Yugoslavia is listening and understands our deep concern about this and other human rights cases.

The bill calling for the temporary suspension of most-favored-nation status for Yugoslavia is receiving overwhelming support. "In just 24 hours, the bill that Chairman FASCELL and I sponsored has nearly 150 cosponsors. Our Michigan Senators also introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

Most-favored-nation status would be denied to that country until Mr. Ivezaj, and two other Americans are freed. The Yugoslav Government's policy of arresting visiting Americans and denying them consular access must stop. This foolishness has gone on far too long.

I am heartened to know that the Yugoslav Embassy obtained a copy of the bill. I hope that the government of that country appreciates our real concern about the tragic imprisonment of these Americans.

I am still working to get more members to cosponsor the bill. Obviously, pressure is building. I trust that they are listening in Belgrade.

STAUNCHING THE FLOW OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, last night this House passed a historic immigration reform bill. It was not perfect, but it was a great sight better than what we have now.

There is one glaring defect to the bill: It turns on this enormous magnet of legalization, of amnesty, while our borders are totally porous.

I have been suggesting an amendment for the last 5 years in this House that would delay the date of amnesty until a Presidential Commission certified that our borders were reasonably secure.

Senator SIMPSON accepted this amendment in his bill and, as amended by Senator METZENBAUM, it would delay amnesty for no longer than 3 years until such a commission certified that our borders were secure.

I very much hope that the conferees will hold on to that amendment, and I hope that the House will make it its first order of business next year to staunch the avalanche of illegal immigration that will result when this amnesty is passed. The 1982 date is meaningless. Anybody who is here in this country can take advantage of amnesty because forged identity cards are easily available. Whole packets of identity can be purchased with ease on both sides of our Southwest border.

So if we do not do something to firm up those borders, the moment amnes-

ty is effective, we will be inundated with illegal aliens who want to come over here to take advantage of the same American opportunities, the same American freedoms that our ancestors sought generations ago.

We cannot afford it; our capacities are limited; our absorptive capability is limited.

We are not doing enough for the poor people, the hopefully aspiring who are in our midst now.

So let us firm up our borders and have an immigration policy that protects the rights of those who seek entry legally, rather than an unworkable system and porous borders that reward anyone from the developing world who wishes to crash through illegally.

ARNIE'S INSPIRATION: "JOE" McDADE, NOW WORLD CUP CHAMPION OF GOLF

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, we have a sports celebrity in our midst. Usually mild-mannered JOE McDADE, our esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania, proved to be the "spark" behind Arnold Palmer's masterful play when Arnie, JOE and their foursome won the Chrysler World Cup Pro-Am Division, held last month in Potomac, MD. Leading the way to victory, JOE birdied the first hole. The throngs following the foursome could feel victory, only 17 short holes away. JOE, himself, could sense the inevitability of the championship.

Arnie, meanwhile, was feeling the pressure. His famous "Arnie's Army" following, was quickly becoming the "McDade Mob." Reacting to the pressure like only Arnie can do, he calmly approached the tee of the third hole, picked a middle iron, and swacked a clean shot toward the hole. With but a single bounce, Arnie's ball dropped into the cup—a hole in one. A golfer's dream.

Few who witnessed this historic event, which was followed by another Palmer ace on the same hole the very next day, would deny that JOE McDADE, the Pride of Scranton, PA, playing the round of his life, was almost singularly responsible for Arnie's hole in one. If it hadn't been for JOE's outstanding playing, Arnie wouldn't have been inspired.

Those golfers or golfing fans interested in the full details of this magnificent and inspiring tale would do well to get to JOE quickly. For, as all great sporting tales do, this one will undoubtedly grow in magnitude with each passing day. By year's end, it will be Arnie who provided the moral support and kept JOE's feet to the fire,

and JOE who clinched the victory with his hole in one.

Congratulations, JOE, on your memorable and inspiring victory. Congressman JOE MCDADE is now World Cup Champion of Golf. Eat your heart out, MARTY RUSSO.

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT IS EXPORTING U.S. JOBS

(Mr. TALLON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, just when you think you've seen it all, this administration comes up with something to top it.

I have a copy of a brochure describing an event the U.S. Department of Commerce, through the United States Trade Center in Mexico City, is sponsoring in Acapulco to encourage U.S. companies to relocate their assembly plants in Mexico.

This brochure highlights the Mexican in-bond program which appeals to industrialists because of low wages and benefits that allow goods to be imported without payment of Mexican duty, and finished products to be exported to the United States with tariffs only on the value added in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, we have pleaded with the administration to formulate and implement a strong trade policy. But evidently the Commerce Department didn't realize we meant an American trade policy.

We want to have good relations with our neighbors to the south, but that doesn't go so far as giving away our American jobs.

Our Government's sponsorship of the export of American jobs is contrary to the legitimate, practical State and Federal programs designed to fight unemployment here at home and retrain our displaced workers.

The brochure for the event shows two hot air balloons in the colors of Mexico and the United States and the words, "where Mexican business and American business can rise to new heights."

I believe a better slogan would be "where the administration of this great Nation declares total surrender in its trade policy."

The hot air balloons are appropriate as the Department of Commerce is apparently only concerned with shipping American jobs over the border.

Mr. Speaker, we should be outraged at the attitude shown by the Department of Commerce in sanctioning this event, and the illogical use of American taxpayers' money.

I call on my colleagues to join me in voicing our opposition to the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Baldrige.

OCCAM'S RAZOR

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, William Occam was a philosopher of 13th century England. He is credited with the philosophical maxim, known as Occam's razor, which is this: "Entities are not to be multiplied without necessity", or: "It is vain to do with more what can be done with fewer."

The money supply in this country is increasing at the annual rate of 14 percent, well above the target range the Federal Reserve Board has set for itself. The monetarists were obviously wrong when they predicted that such an extensive monetary expansion would inevitably spill over in the commodity markets, as a result of the operation of Occam's razor. Prices are ebbing, not rising, to the chagrin of American farmers and other exporters.

Yet, the dollar is getting ready for Occam's razor. After all, the excess dollars could spill over in the stock market or in the bond market. We would do well to remember the last devastation Occam's razor caused in response to the dollar-proliferation of the 1920's; namely, the Great Depression of the 1930's.

The 20th century English thinker, Bertrand Russell, interpreted Occam's razor as saying that if everything in some science can be explained without assuming this or that hypothetical entity, then there is no ground for assuming it. The philosopher added: "I have myself found this a most fruitful principle in logical analysis."

Mr. Speaker, the price explosions of the 1970's, and the price implosions of the 1980's, can be fully accounted for in terms of the anchorless dollar, as it is tossed around by an angry sea. Price swings are merely a mirror image of the waxing and waning dollar, even as they act as the wrecker's ball in destroying productive effort in this country. We behave rather foolishly when we try to rationalize these market aberrations by attributing them to this or that combination of export interests abroad. We have only ourselves to blame for our folly of setting the dollar adrift, causing the present price instability, and for the even greater folly of refusing to drop the golden anchor.

MR. PRESIDENT, WE WILL BE HEARD

(Mrs. BOXER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the President in his presummit meeting, but I must ask this question: Where is it written in the Consti-

tution that when our President goes to a presummit meeting, Congress folds up its tent and plays dead? That is what the President wants.

Well, I am sorry, Mr. President, we will be heard. We will not be part of your disinformation campaign whether it is telling the American people that there was no trade for Mr. Daniloff or that there is no CIA involvement in Nicaragua or that this Congress is responsible for the deficit when it was your policy of 130-percent increase in military spending coupled with your tax loopholes that caused this problem.

We will be heard on arms control as well as waste control at the Pentagon. We are no stronger when we pay \$7,000 for coffee pots and muzzle whistlers.

Mr. President, why do you not take our arms control policy ideas to the summit and use them in the spirit in which they were offered, the spirit of peace and patriotic common sense?

THE SOVIET CONCILIATORY STANCE

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet media blitz is on. Earlier this week they reannounced their plan to withdraw air defense troops from Afghanistan. It took them over 6 years to figure out the freedom fighters there did not have an air force.

Today's Washington Post carries the headline "Soviets Conciliatory, Allow Jewish Dissident to Emigrate." Mr. Gorbachev must be chuckling all the way to the bargaining table.

The Post says General Secretary Gorbachev is "conciliatory" for permitting Inessa Flerov to leave the Soviet Union to give a bone marrow transplant to her brother who is dying of leukemia in Israel. Little is made of the fact that Mr. Gorbachev stood in the way of their reunification until this moment.

Mr. Speaker, let's remember that 98 percent of the Soviet troops sent to Afghanistan remain there after almost 7 years of bloody warfare. Let's remember that despite the recent release of Yuri Orlov, 99 percent of Soviet Jews remain captive behind the Iron Curtain. As long as a brief exception for propaganda's sake is portrayed as conciliatory, there is little hope for the hundreds of thousands denied their basic human rights in the Soviet Union and Afghanistan.

□ 1015

EXPO MAQUILA 1986

(Mr. KOLTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking once again about Expo Maquila 1986. Since Tuesday, when I first exposed this to my colleagues here, I had a meeting with the Department of Commerce. We found that the Mexican Government pays these working people, mostly young men and young women, \$1 an hour which includes benefits.

And what are the benefits? The benefits include holidays off, transportation to and from work, meals, dances, and sporting events.

This is the first time in history that this program is being sponsored totally by the U.S. Department of Commerce. The Commerce Department says this program will keep American companies from completely moving out of these United States.

So far we have lost in the month of September 38,000 jobs, 38,000 manufacturing jobs, and throughout the year of 1986, we have lost over 200,000 jobs.

This has to stop. We must not allow our tax dollars and our time and effort to send U.S. jobs abroad.

Let us say, "adios" to this misguided program.

DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGNS

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California a few minutes ago referred to what she called the President's disinformation campaign. In listening to the gentlewoman's speech, I have to believe that she is conducting a disinformation campaign of her own.

First of all, the gentlewoman blames the President for the deficit. Well we cannot spend 1 dime of money, the President cannot and the country cannot, without this Congress approving. We are the people who approve the spending, and we will be approving spending of major significance in the hours just ahead of us here. I wonder where that fits into the gentlewoman's speech.

The gentlewoman blamed this Government for CIA involvement in Nicaragua. The only people saying that are the Soviet-backed Sandinistas. Evidently, the gentlewoman believes them rather than her own Government.

I really question when people come to the floor with what has to be labeled as disinformation campaigns of their own.

WHO IS REALLY TYING THE PRESIDENT'S HANDS?

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed by reports that internal conflicts within the administration may once again prevent any real movement toward an arms control agreement at the meeting between the President and Mr. Gorbachev in Iceland this weekend.

I fervently hope that those elements among the President's advisers who oppose any arms agreement have not lost what is a golden opportunity for progress.

It is important to make perfectly clear to the American people who it is that is really tying the hands of the President in Iceland.

It is not the Congress. Nothing in the package of amendments passed by the House has any relation to the area of greatest potential immediate progress, the issue of intermediate nuclear forces.

On that question, it is the hard-line faction within the administration that is doing everything possible to block progress. They are the ones warning the President of the dangers or reaching any agreement.

This administration has already shown it is very adept at disinformation campaigns. Let's not be fooled by this latest smokescreen. If no concrete progress comes from the Iceland meeting, it will not be those of us in Congress who want real arms control who will be sipping champagne, it will be the hardliners at the Pentagon.

OUR TAX DOLLARS GOING TO ORTEGA VIA INDIA

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it was brought to my attention yesterday that we are giving India approximately \$600 million in aid, American taxpayers' dollars. I found out that a couple of weeks ago, in fact, last week, the Prime Minister of India invited Daniel Ortega, the Communist dictator of Nicaragua, to his country and gave him \$10 million in aid.

Mr. Ortega then got on a plane and flew to Peking, probably to buy weapons from the Chinese Communists.

Can you imagine that, American taxpayers' dollars are going to buy weapons to fight people who are fighting for freedom in Central America? It is unbelievable.

It is one thing to directly aid and abet an enemy, but to use American taxpayer's dollars to aid the Communists in Central America is unforgivable, but it is happening.

I urge this body to reevaluate its foreign policy toward India. We should not give them 1 dime as long as they are using our taxpayers' dollars to sub-

sidize the Communists in Central America.

IT IS UP TO US TO ACT, AND TO ACT NOW

(Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAY OF Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, this Congress is coming to a close and we are making history by passing tax reform and immigration bills, but yet there is one continued problem that faces us that we have not completed action on, and I am becoming completely discouraged that we are not going to be able to meet our responsibilities, and that is the deficit and deficit reduction.

Right now reconciliation is being held up over whether we are going to defend the investment bankers and the oil industry or whether or not we are going to hold poor families together by providing for unemployed parents being able to stay in the home.

It seems to me, ladies and gentlemen of this body, that we are at a very critical stage where we must determine whether we are going to live under the Gramm-Rudman guidelines and meet the threshold.

It is my hope that next week or today, the committees of jurisdiction will work out their disagreements, that the other body would stop defending the oil industry and also the investment bankers, and support the poor families in their efforts to stay together, so that we can conclude the deficit reduction package that will exceed over \$12 billion and bring us down to the Gramm-Rudman targets, and thus we will be able to go home and tell our constituents that we have met those targets, we have taken definitive action.

It is up to us to act, and to act now.

AMERICA IS LOSING BUSINESSES AND LOSING JOBS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I just heard the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON] saying they lost 450 manufacturing jobs. I do not know what the big news is about that. We keep hearing it every day.

It takes me back, though, to an amendment that I was able to pass to the defense that passed this House 241 to 163, that gives a weighted advantage to American firms. It was literally shot down in the other body, and I knew it would be. I was told by our conferees that there was no way of keeping it.

I am not laying blame on the other side today. I am not laying blame, and it is very unpopular on my side. They elected us here to temper the policies of the White House. We have not done it. We have not provided that balance.

And where Mr. TALLON is upset about the Commerce Department's activity to take American businesses to Mexico, I received an anonymous packet that shows where Packard Electric will develop five more plants in Mexico, and not near the border, they are moving inside. They have one plant in West Germany because they are getting a tax break. And they will have a fixed population work force in America, folks, which means through attrition, when a person retires, they will use their job in America. I think it is high time that if we have to appeal to this side of the aisle, you were elected to temper that other side. I do not blame them. I now lay blame on my own side.

THE B-1 STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND PENETRATOR AIRCRAFT

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, in defense, little things happen all around this world that we really are not tracking or aware of in this body.

In the history of the U.S. Air Force, October will go down as a prime month for that select few who protect our way of life.

On the first of this month, the first B-1 Strategic Air Command penetrator aircraft went on active duty alert armed with nuclear weapons to maintain the peace in this world. It was at Dyess Air Force Base, in Mr. STENHOLM's district in Texas. The pilot was Capt. John Schilstrom; the copilot, Capt. Richard Davis; the offensive systems officer, Capt. Steven Clark; the defensive systems officer, Capt. Timothy Young. The proud commander of that 96th Bombardment Wing is Col. Bob Dempsey; and the commander of the 15th Air Force out in my area at March Air Force Base is Lt. Gen. James E. Light.

We could have had this plane standing alert 5 years earlier if it was not for the confusion about defense in this body. With a 5-year delay, but better than never, we will have a total complement of combat-ready aircraft at Dyess Air Force Base by December 1986, Ellsworth by September 1987, Grand Forks a few months after that, and McConnell, KS, will have a complement of their B-1 aircraft totally arrived between February 1988 and June of next year.

□ 1025

I thank all the Members that supported this great aircraft and gave our young pilots in the Strategic Air Command something other than a kamikaze mission and it is too bad that we cannot replace every B-52 within the next few years. I look forward to supporting the B-2, that is the Stealth bomber program.

I tell my friends in the Air Force: Get around to naming the B-2 and stop calling it by its test designation.

WE DO NOT BELIEVE IN PAYING MORE AND GETTING LESS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the high noon stakes keep going on and we see everybody wanting to emulate Clint Eastwood or John Wayne or whatever, threatening to close down Government; threatening to do all sorts of things.

Let us put the record straight: No. 1, the President is in Iceland and his hands are not tied. We have not coupled the arms control agreements to any of the short-term continuing resolutions that will keep this Government going. I think we should make that very clear because a lot of disinformation is going out on that issue.

No. 2, to close this Government down you will not save money. Once again, I remind this body that my subcommittee has finished an extensive study showing it will cost \$62 million a day to close this Government down. That is a very high ticket price for that kind of political theater.

This body will do everything it can do to keep the Government running. We do not believe in paying more and getting less. That is exactly what will happen if the President refuses to keep it going.

So I hope we keep the facts straight and I hope we do not get into some kind of stampede mentality that just costs money and gets us less and angers taxpayers more.

THANKS, MR. SPEAKER

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, during your distinguished administration as Speaker of the House, you have provided great leadership and support for many programs to enhance the lives of millions of Americans. No group of citizens have benefited more from your service than our Nation's veterans and their families, and they will never forget you.

Never once have you wavered in your support of veterans legislation

and hundreds of bills have passed this House and become law during your years as Speaker. One of your greatest accomplishments has been to bring back the new GI bill for the young men and women who serve in the Armed Forces. I have talked with hundreds of service personnel since we enacted the bill in late 1984, and once again bright men and women are joining the services because of the new GI bill.

Before you leave the House, on behalf of these men and women and some 28 million living veterans, and 55 million dependents of veterans, I would like to say, "thank you, Mr. Speaker."

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 585) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the privileged resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 585

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Armed Services: Neil Abercrombie, Hawaii;

Committee on Public Works and Transportation: Mario Biaggi, New York; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Charles W. Stenholm, Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GODSPEED AND GOOD LUCK, NEIL

(Ms. OAKAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 seconds.)

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to simply pay tribute to NEIL ABERCROMBIE of Hawaii, who, in his brief stay in Congress has cast very momentous votes. So much so that there is an important article in the New York Times about him. He is one of the finest Members that I have served with.

We will really miss him and we want to wish him well. Godspeed and good luck, NEIL.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Senate:

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to communicate to the President of the United States and to the House of Representatives the order and judgment of the Senate in the case of Harry E. Claiborne and transmit a certified copy of same to each.

JUDGMENT

The Senate having tried Harry E. Claiborne, United States District Judge for the District of Nevada, upon four Articles of Impeachment exhibited against him by the House of Representatives, and two-thirds of the Senators present having found him guilty of the charges contained in the First, Second, and Fourth Articles of Impeachment: it is therefore,

Ordered and adjudged, That the said Harry E. Claiborne be, and he is hereby removed from the office.

WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES AND TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. LEVINE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the downing of an American transport plane by the Nicaraguan Army, persistent reports of Saudi Arabian funding of the Contras have once again surfaced in the press.

Some months ago, the press reported that the Saudis have been funneling substantial funds to the Contras. These reports said that the Saudi support of the Contras was part of the 1982 AWAC's sale and were being coordinated by former high-ranking American defense officials.

My hometown newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, yesterday cited a Contra official as the source of its story. Newsday ran a similar story citing Pentagon sources. While both the State Department and the Saudi Government have denied these stories, it certainly appears that something is going on here. These renewed press reports deserve to be fully investigated by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the facts are in this case, but I do believe that we in this House have a responsibility to get to the truth. We owe it both to ourselves and to the American people.

SUPPORT THE UNEMPLOYED PARENT PROGRAM

(Mr. FORD of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Unemployed Parent Program that is a part of the reconciliation that has been reported from the House Ways and Means Committee. I understand that on the other side of the Capitol in the other body now there has been talk from some of the leaders that reconciliation cannot come back to the House floor until such time that we would drop the unemployed parent provision.

I certainly would hope that my colleagues here in the House would send a very clear message to our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol com-

municating that we need the Unemployed Parent Program. It is a program that we have had in reconciliation for the past 3 years. I do not see why half of the States of this Nation who have opted out to not participate in the Unemployed Parent Program to say to the profamily, structured families of this Nation that a father has every right to live in the household, to be with his children. We should not deny the children of this Nation in half of the States that their father must leave the home in order for them to be eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

I certainly would urge my colleagues here in the House to let us be firm on that issue and hopefully that the Members of the other body will send back in that conference reconciliation that they will recede to the House and agree that the father in fact should be a part of the family structure.

□ 1035

INTERFERENCE WITH VOTERS' RIGHTS

(Mr. FRENZEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, judging by a recent editorial, the Washington Post seems to believe that vote fraud and ballot-stuffing are rare and isolated instances in American politics.

Unfortunately, that is not the case. According to undisputed testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, more than 100,000 fraudulent votes were cast in the city of Chicago in the 1982 election. The 1982 gubernatorial race was decided by approximately 5,000 votes. There have been numerous vote-buying indictments in the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana arising out of the 1984 election which the Democrat Members of Congress say was won by four votes by the present Democrat Congressman. Last year, a State representative in Hawaii was sentenced to a 5-year jail term for voter registration fraud.

Two Members of this House from Louisiana have resigned under indictment or threat of indictment, and one of them was sent to jail.

The emperors in the glass palace at the Washington Post seem to be dressed in their normal suit of clothes. It is about time for them to take a serious look at the problem.

The worst inference with voters' rights in this country is if one's vote is invalidated by the vote of a tombstone, lightpost, a fire hydrant, a fill-in station, or an empty lot. It is about time we got to work on this problem.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 751, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1987

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 751) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the chairman if he would consider changing the date of the resolution from October 15, to Saturday, midnight, October 11.

There is still some hope that we can reach an agreement in conference today, but on my side of the aisle the leadership feels that an extension through the 15th will simply grind everything to a halt for the next few days and we will go home for the weekend and we will not get much done until again on Tuesday.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to consider it; however, I would not be able to agree. I am glad to have a recess while we discuss the wisdom of continuing it to Saturday.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the leadership, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 751, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1987

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 583 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 583

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 751) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, in the House, debate on the joint resolution shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. **MOAKLEY**] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. **MOAKLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. **LATTA**], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 583 is the rule providing for the consideration in the House of House Joint Resolution 751 making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, what this is, is an extension of the current continuing resolution that the House passed on Wednesday October 8, through Wednesday October 15, 1986. A basic 5-day extension that would allow the funding of nonessential Government services through the holiday weekend.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a result of an agreement between both majority and minority members on the Appropriations Committee, that will allow the conferees more time to continue to work out any differences and ultimately reach an agreement for a final spending bill.

Mr. **LATTA**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order a resolution to extend the continuing resolution appropriation until October 15, 1986. According to testimony in the Rules Committee, this is the same language passed by the House and signed by the President 2 days ago, except for the date change. There is no language in this resolution dealing with air traffic controllers or any other extraneous material.

Mr. Speaker, the existing extension of the continuing appropriation expires at midnight tonight. If nothing is done the Government will be without funds tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration in the House. That means the continuing resolution appropriation extension can be debated for up to 1 hour. But no amendments will be in order. The rule does provide for one motion to recommit. However, because of the limited scope of this resolution extending the continuing appropriation, about the only things that could be changed by a motion to recommit with instructions would be the October 15 date or the addition of a limitation on the use of the funds.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this rule so that the House may have an opportunity to work its will on still another extension of the continuing appropriation.

Mr. **MOAKLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I

move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. **WALKER**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 115, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—265

Abercrombie	Edwards (CA)	Luken
Ackerman	Emerson	MacKay
Akaka	English	Manton
Alexander	Erdreich	Markey
Anderson	Evans (IL)	Martin (IL)
Annunzio	Fascell	Martin (NY)
Anthony	Fazio	Martinez
Applegate	Feighan	Matsui
Aspin	Fish	Mavroules
Atkins	Flippo	Mazzoli
AuCoin	Florio	McCloskey
Barnard	Foglietta	McCollum
Barnes	Foley	McDade
Bateman	Ford (MI)	McHugh
Bates	Ford (TN)	McKinney
Bedell	Frank	Mica
Bellenson	Frost	Michel
Bennett	Garcia	Mikulski
Berman	Gaydos	Miller (CA)
Bevill	Geldenson	Miller (OH)
Biaggi	Gephardt	Mineta
Billey	Gibbons	Moakley
Boggs	Gilman	Mollohan
Boner (TN)	Glickman	Montgomery
Bonior (MI)	Goodling	Moody
Bonker	Gordon	Moorhead
Borski	Gradison	Morrison (CT)
Bosco	Gray (IL)	Mrazek
Boulter	Gray (PA)	Murphy
Boxer	Green	Murtha
Brown (CA)	Guarini	Myers
Bruce	Hall, Ralph	Natcher
Bryant	Hamilton	Neal
Bustamante	Hatcher	Nelson
Byron	Hawkins	Nowak
Carper	Hayes	Oaker
Carr	Hefner	Oberstar
Chapman	Hertel	Obey
Chappell	Horton	Ortiz
Clay	Howard	Panetta
Clinger	Hoyer	Parris
Coelho	Huckaby	Pease
Coleman (TX)	Hughes	Penny
Collins	Hutto	Pepper
Conte	Jacobs	Perkins
Cooper	Jenkins	Pickle
Coughlin	Johnson	Porter
Coyne	Jones (NC)	Price
Crockett	Jones (TN)	Quillen
Darden	Kanjorski	Rangel
Daschle	Kastenmeier	Ray
de la Garza	Kennelly	Regula
Dellums	Kildee	Reid
Derrick	Kleczka	Richardson
Dicks	Kolter	Ridge
Dingell	LaFalce	Rinaldo
DioGuardi	Lantos	Ritter
Donnelly	Latta	Robinson
Dorgan (ND)	Leath (TX)	Rodino
Dowdy	Lehman (CA)	Roe
Downey	Lehman (FL)	Rogers
Durbin	Levin (MI)	Rose
Dwyer	Levine (CA)	Rostenkowski
Dymally	Lipinski	Roth
Dyson	Loeffler	Roukema
Eckart (OH)	Long	Rowland (CT)
Eckert (NY)	Lujan	Rowland (GA)

Roybal	St Germain	Walden
Sabo	Staggers	Walgren
Savage	Stallings	Watkins
Scheuer	Stark	Waxman
Schneider	Stenholm	Weaver
Schroeder	Stratton	Wheat
Schuettle	Studds	Whitley
Schumer	Swift	Whitten
Sharp	Synar	Wise
Shelby	Tallon	Wolf
Sikorski	Tauzin	Wolpe
Sisisky	Taylor	Wortley
Skeen	Thomas (GA)	Wright
Skelton	Torres	Wyden
Slattery	Torricelli	Wylie
Slaughter	Towns	Yates
Smith (FL)	Trafficant	Yatron
Smith (IA)	Udall	Young (AK)
Smith (NE)	Valentine	Young (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Vento	Young (MO)
Solarz	Visclosky	
Spratt	Volkmer	

NAYS—115

Archer	Gingrich	Molinari
Armey	Gonzalez	Monson
Badham	Gregg	Morrison (WA)
Barton	Gunderson	Nielson
Bereuter	Hammerschmidt	Oxley
Billakis	Hansen	Packard
Boehler	Hendon	Pashayan
Broomfield	Henry	Petri
Brown (CO)	Hill	Pursell
Burton (IN)	Hopkins	Roberts
Callahan	Hubbard	Roemer
Carney	Hunter	Saxton
Chandler	Hyde	Schaefer
Chappie	Ireland	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	Jeffords	Shaw
Coats	Kasich	Shumway
Cobey	Kemp	Shuster
Coble	Kramer	Siljander
Coleman (MO)	Lagomarsino	Smith, Denny
Combest	Leach (IA)	(OR)
Courter	Lent	Smith, Robert
Craig	Lewis (CA)	(NH)
Crane	Lewis (FL)	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Lightfoot	(OR)
Daub	Livingston	Snowe
Davis	Lloyd	Solomon
DeLay	Lott	Spence
DeWine	Lowery (CA)	Stangeland
Dickinson	Lowry (WA)	Strang
Dornan (CA)	Lungren	Stump
Dreier	Mack	Sundquist
Duncan	Madigan	Sweeney
Evans (IA)	Marlenee	Swindall
Fawell	McCandless	Thomas (CA)
Fiedler	McEwen	Vander Jagt
Fields	McGrath	Vucanovich
Franklin	McKernan	Walker
Frenzel	McMillan	Whittaker
Gallo	Meyers	
Gekas	Miller (WA)	

NOT VOTING—52

Andrews	Hall (OH)	Rahall
Bartlett	Hartnett	Rudd
Bentley	Hillis	Russo
Boland	Holt	Schulze
Boucher	Jones (OK)	Seiberling
Breaux	Kaptur	Snyder
Brooks	Kindness	Stokes
Burton (CA)	Kolbe	Tauke
Campbell	Kostmayer	Traxler
Conyers	Leland	Weber
Daniel	Lundine	Weiss
Dixon	McCain	Whitehurst
Early	McCurdy	Williams
Edgar	Mitchell	Wilson
Edwards (OK)	Moore	Wirth
Fowler	Nichols	Zschau
Fuqua	Olin	
Grotberg	Owens	

□ 1100

Mr. **FAWELL** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. **BONKER** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5234, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1987

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight, October 13, 1986, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 5234) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1987

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 583 I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 751) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 751

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 102(c) of the joint resolution of October 9, 1986 (Public Law 99-464) is hereby amended by striking out "October 10, 1986" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 15, 1986".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is a short-term extension of the existing continuing resolution to carry forward Government programs until next Wednesday, October 15, at midnight.

This is a one-word resolution. It strikes out the reference to October 10 and insert October 15, 1986. No other changes are made to the current CR, which the President signed and is in place.

I would remind my colleagues that the continuing resolution which I just made reference to does not carry the so-called controller language that the President objected to and which

caused a veto the other day. This extension does not carry that language.

Our conferees, and I hope Members will listen to this, continue to meet. We are making progress. Senator HARTFIELD, the chairman of our conference, with my approval, announced that he would be able to conclude conference this afternoon and produce a bill that will go to the President, hopefully agreeable, but at any rate it will move. That would give time to do the necessary paperwork to bring the conference agreement to the House floor Tuesday morning.

This extension for 5 days should be noncontroversial. It continues the ordinary operations of the Government until next Wednesday, and it should avoid a Government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, so that the House knows at least where I am coming from, there will be a motion to recommit on this side of the aisle offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] to extend the CR until midnight Saturday. Should that motion not prevail, and I am not urging anyone else to follow me, I will vote for the resolution of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] to extend the CR until Wednesday.

Why do I feel that we should have it until midnight tomorrow night? I think that we should keep everyone's feet to the fire. As I said earlier this week, in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], I think that we are moving in the right direction. Last night we had reports to the full conference. There were only three subcommittees who had a significant number of items in disagreement; they were Defense, Foreign Operations, and Commerce-Justice-State.

Then there were other subcommittees who had other items not as substantial as those in disagreement, and it looked like we were making some progress.

However, I feel that if we go to the 15th, the Congress will adjourn here at I understand 3 o'clock, and the conferees will go home. They will go home for Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, and then come back Tuesday, and I think that we will be in here again next Wednesday for another continuation of the CR. This is unfortunate.

Let me say this: Even though there has been progress, there are a lot of real big issues out there about which the administration keeps calling and saying, "If any one of these single items are in the bill we will not sign the continuing resolution."

Let me give a couple. There is the PATCO issue. I keep telling OMB that the PATCO issue is in the Senate and the House, in both versions. I do not

know how you are going to get the PATCO issue out of there. There is double breasting in the Health and Human Services Subcommittee. There is labor protection in regard to the merger of the airlines. With any one of those, they say, there is going to be a veto.

Then of course we have the six issues that they are complaining about in the Defense appropriation, not even to mention, the amount of money in the Defense appropriation, of course. The one that is in complete disarray is Foreign Operations. Everything is broken down there between the House and the Senate. So we have some real difficult, knotty problems.

Again, and I do not want to sound like a broken record, and I am looking at the next Speaker of the House, I hope that the 100th Congress will do the right thing. I hope that we will not be in this quagmire that we are in right now.

□ 1110

We are at a point where we cannot legislate any more. The first thing we ought to do is repeal Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. It is not working. The other thing we ought to do is repeal the Budget Act. It is not working.

We just cannot keep going on shoving these things back on the burner. I just hope that the debt limit comes to the floor with an open rule so that I can tack on some amendments to repeal both of those laws so that we can come into the 100th Congress and we will be a streamlined Congress.

What we have set up here is another bureaucracy in the Budget Act which tied up all of the appropriation bills over there until they had a 302 allocation. And here we are in the second week, coming into the second week of the new fiscal year and we have not passed one appropriation bill.

I wonder what Gorbachev will be thinking when he sits down with President Reagan over in Iceland. You want to talk about these big issues. You cannot even run the Government over there. The Government is at a standstill. It is a joke.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding.

There are some of us, however, that feel that we might be better off if we repealed the Appropriations Committee in this place.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as usual, the gentleman from Kentucky has really done his homework.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any indication as to the intention of the President with respect to this particular CR if we should pass one that is now on the floor?

Mr. CONTE. The only thing I can say is he left for Iceland. On the steps of the plane he said that he did not want any more extensions.

Well that is fine and dandy, but let us face the realities. You might get away with no extension because of Saturday, Sunday, and the holiday Monday. But you come in here and you shut that Government down Tuesday, and you are going to be paying about \$100 million a day wasted, right down the drain like corn down a rat-hole because you do not have a continuing resolution.

We do not have money to spend for a new pair of shoes around here.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank my friend for yielding. The suggestion about abolishing House committees wholly aside, I would like to engage my friend in a colloquy.

My friend from Massachusetts is a soft-spoken gentleman, and I know we all want to hear his wisdom. I just ask my friend, we all want to pass this bill and we all want to pass it as soon as we can, and there is progress being made. It is frustrating that the progress has not been made more rapidly, obviously.

But does it not really make sense to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we extend it until Tuesday or Wednesday, given the fact that even if it were resolved in conceptual form in the committee today it still would take until next week to put it into legal form? And given the fact further that the other body has already adjourned for the weekend, and they are just in pro forma session today and will not be in session tomorrow. So does it not really make sense that we go ahead and extend it until Tuesday or Wednesday of next week so that we do not have to come in here and look like we are in total disarray and do this same thing all over again?

Mr. CONTE. Well, if the other body is in a pro forma session, how are they going to handle this continuing resolution?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is a good question. I am sorry to say I do not have the answer to that.

While we are abolishing things, maybe we could consider—

Mr. CONTE. We might as well not even act on this if they are not going to act on it.

Mr. WRIGHT. At least, if they were unable to take action on it, the House would be on record. If the Govern-

ment came to a crashing halt, it would not be on our head.

Let me just remind the gentleman of our colloquy 2 days ago in which I think we both agreed that Tuesday was a more realistic expectation than Friday. The gentleman and I had a colloquy in the Record and the gentleman from Massachusetts agreed at that time. I said would the gentleman agree that Tuesday is a more realistic expectation, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, said he could not agree more. Mr. Speaker, I think Tuesday would be more reasonable. Then I said would he agree that if we give you an extension until Friday, which we agreed to do, and then would do our dead level best to try to find some common ground on which we could satisfy it, and then come back, and if we were not successful extend it again, and the gentleman from Massachusetts:

Certainly, I would give the gentleman my word on that, and then come Friday afternoon around this time if it looks like we are not going to come to a settlement, then I would support my good chairman and have another continuing resolution which brings us in to some other day next week.

That is where we are now.

Mr. CONTE. Let me respond to that. If I correctly remember, that was around 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. WRIGHT. 2:20.

Mr. CONTE. It was 2:20 in the afternoon, and here we are at 11:15 in the morning.

Certainly the gentleman heard me in the colloquy with my chairman. I would prefer to make it midnight and will vote to make it midnight Saturday. If that fails, then I will support the chairman to make it Tuesday.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, the conferees I know have been meeting. Are you going to resume meeting soon?

Mr. CONTE. They are supposed to, yes, Agriculture is supposed to be meeting. Commerce is supposed to meet.

Mr. LOTT. Are we making progress? The gentleman was saying last week, I think the chairman was saying progress was being made, agreements were being reached in transportation, in HUD, and all of these other areas.

Mr. CONTE. We are making progress. I reported that three committees have not reported because they have major, major differences. All of the other committees have reported with certain exceptions. Public Works has a couple of problems with Senator HATFIELD on the nuclear waste dump, which I hope the House is not going to get into.

Mr. LOTT. I certainly agree on that.

Mr. CONTE. If any of you have been targeted, you ought to be following this one. This is a real hot issue.

Then there are a lot of other issues out there that I mentioned, double-breasting, PATCO, labor protection.

Mr. LOTT. Were those not the same issues that were holding us up a week ago and will be holding us up a week from now if we allow it to continue to just drag on? Let me ask the gentleman that.

Mr. CONTE. A week ago today we had not settled anything, so we have made some progress. We are moving very quickly, at a snail's pace.

Mr. LOTT. Then we are really down to the same issues that we knew we would wind up being deadlocked on days or weeks ago, right? I mean they are the things like PATCO and nuclear waste and arms control and a few things like that. But will the conferees meet tonight and tomorrow?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, of course I cannot speak for the leadership on this side or that side, but I would call attention to the fact that I stated a while ago when perhaps many people did not hear it. In the first place, may I say all subcommittees are meeting, trying to resolve those differences.

But last evening, Senator HATFIELD, who is chairman of our conference this year, announced that he will be able to conclude conference this afternoon and produce a bill that will go to the President, hopefully agreeable, but at any rate it will move. That would give some time to do the necessary paperwork to bring the conference agreement to the House floor on Tuesday for a vote.

The Senator announced yesterday that those places where they were in disagreement at this stage or by this afternoon, it is evident that they are not going to agree until the last minute.

Mr. LOTT. That is right, and that is my point.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am telling the gentleman what he said, which meant that if there is disagreement, he agrees that we are going to have a vote, and then the outcome will be brought before the floor for a decision by the House itself.

□ 1120

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield just one more moment, to make my key point, and that will be it.

The conferees are never going to agree until the last minute. They are not going to agree until we say not one more second, not one more extension,

not now, not tomorrow—let us get this thing over with. We will be here next Thursday if we keep granting these extensions.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk big and mean every word of it, but we still have to deal with our colleagues—we can make strong statements here and we are very serious and sincere about them, but there is another body in this Congress; we cannot speak for them.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention at the end of the debate to present a motion to recommend to change the date from Wednesday to the 11th.

The reason for doing that, even though I totally agree with the point made by Mr. LOTT a moment ago, these extensions are crazy. Nonetheless we should attempt at least to pass a resolution that might be acceptable to the administration; so we keep the pressure on our committees and try to get our work done by Saturday night.

Otherwise, it is very clear that the majority of the committee people around here will wander off, go home; we will get back to meeting maybe on Wednesday. We will be through all next week. Either we close the Government down for a month or another continuation will take place.

I will present that motion and I urge its adoption.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to make one observation based on the colloquy the two gentleman from Mississippi had.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], my chairman, is absolutely right. It takes two to tango. Let me give you one example: This House passed my amendment on a farm payment limitation unanimously. We have been in that conference on agriculture, and the chairman over there on the other side just will not even discuss the thing. Will not discuss it.

We discussed it once yesterday morning, and then he keeps on saying: "We'll take it to the full conference. We'll take it to the full conference." Hoping that some way, somewhere, at midnight or 3 o'clock in the morning, he is going to be able to kill that amendment which is only a tiny, tiny little step forward in trying to clean up that farm program that this year alone, in CCC payments, has cost us over \$26 billion.

The presses down there in the Bureau of Engraving are not going to be able to roll fast enough next year to pay the money that we need for the farm program, in 1985. That is just one example.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, extending that point, it is most disconcerting that the leadership around here, on the other side of the aisle, is attempting to suggest that the reason we have this problem, this immediate and urgent problem, is because the President wants to somehow close down the Government.

The fact is, we are in this position because our committees have been holding their hands for the entire year doing very little of the work that we have to get done.

At the last moment, we are attempting to use the CR, a half a trillion dollar bill, to authorize every special project and item that the average leader around here thinks is important for his district and for himself.

The CR should not be used for this purpose. Let us put our feet to the fire and get our work done.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, here again the Appropriations Committee is caught in a winch. We all want to get out of here. The Appropriations Committee wants to get out just as badly as any of you; but just as the chairman and the ranking member have said, we are attempting to do this, but we have run into so many problems with the other body. They had the impeachment proceedings; they could not meet with us for about 3 days. We just could not have the opportunity to meet, to work out these problems.

As the ranking member said, we have several really large problems today to work out. We are attempting to do that. Now you can beat your chest down here and say "No more extensions." Who are you hurting?

Are you hurting Members of this Congress? No; we will be here; we will be paid. You are hurting the people who are completely innocent; the Border Patrol, Immigration and Naturalization Service; the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who have to work, no assurance they are going to be paid; you are going to be hurting the people around the country in military service; the cooks, the caretakers, the guards, all of these people who in some way are going to have to be told "Well, on a promise, you are going to be paid."

Those are the innocent people here. By not extending this, you are not putting any pressure on the Appropriations Committee, not in the least. Because we are going to move as rapidly as we and the other body can get together and work out these differences.

So let us be reasonable and let us extend the thing up until next Tuesday or Wednesday, and do it right.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, if I can ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] a question: If we shut down the Government tonight can we pay for the gasoline on Air Force One to get the President back?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. That is exactly right. It happened years ago, you know, when Congress did not appropriate for the fleet; sent it half way around the world.

It just does not make any sense not to extend it reasonably. Because the time, if nothing else, just the time to get paperwork done and do it right. Do you folks want another Gramm-Latta where things were printed in there, telephone numbers? Let us do it right. It is going to take time; we all want to get home, but let us do it right.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] to speak out of order.

YUGOSLAVIA SET TO FREE AMERICAN DETAINEES

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have got some very, very good news for the Congress; and I think they deserve a great deal of credit. I have just received word from our American Ambassador in Yugoslavia, John Scanlon, that not only Peter Ivezaj of Detroit, MI, but the other two that we have been concerned about will be freed within 24 hours.

I want to say that I believe it was the result of the heavy congressional pressure and more than 150 Members indicated their support when I offered the bill, along with Congressmen FASCELL and HERTEL and YARTON and SIMONS yesterday for cutting off the most-favored-nation status.

I think that, along with the State Department's efforts, have brought this result, and I want to send my best wishes to the Ivezaj family. Their nightmare is now over.

All of you know the background of it; he had been sentenced for 7 years; and I believe that the Yugoslav Government has seen the light. Let us hope that we do not have any more cases of innocent human beings being held for no reason.

I hope that these problems are over once and for all, Mr. Speaker. Welcome home, Peter and the others.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERTEL] to speak out of order.

CONGRATULATING THE HOUSE ON QUICK RESPONSE TO THE HOSTAGE-TAKING IN YUGOSLAVIA

(Mr. HERTEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. BROOMFIELD, my Michigan colleague, and the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for doing so much work and spending time daily on the release of this hostage from Yugoslavia.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to express my appreciation to Congressman BROOMFIELD for the outstanding job he has done. One of those three hostages happens to have been a constituent of mine, and I am extremely pleased that he has been successful in implying the necessary leverage to make certain that they are freed, and let us hope that this does not see a repeat in the future.

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are joyous that our Americans are going to be coming home, and while we are in the midst of this debate right now, and considering some of the partisanship that goes on in the last few weeks and during the entire session, I want to remind the citizens of this country how we can work together in a bipartisan fashion and how this Congress can agree and come together so completely.

Over 150 Members, within 24 hours, were so angered by these hostages being taken that they cosponsored the bill that we introduced yesterday. That shows how we can move quickly and in a unified fashion for freedom for our American citizens.

I congratulate this House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

□ 1130

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that we hear the same rhetoric here today we heard a year ago without putting your finger on one of the main reasons why we are here. The defense authorizing committee is 1 year behind on its authorizations. It did not even start hearings until February on the 1987 authorization, and that was a year late. They should have started hearings on the 1988 authorization. Right now, downtown they have already sent the requests to OMB for the 1988 authorization for defense, and they do not have an authorization bill for a guideline. They make up their own. They will start the hearings in February on the 1988 authorization when we have al-

ready gotten up here the appropriation request. That is a year late. It is irrelevant. There are no guidelines. So we wait around here until August to bring out a bill that is a year late, tack on some things that are policy issues onto that bill and let that bill hold us up. We should ignore the bill if it is a year late. The only way to do that is to do what the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FASCELL, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, did when he became chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he had 2-year authorization bills, two of them back to back. He is ahead now. They are sending up their appropriations requests in February based upon an authorization that was used as a guideline that they had to go by.

So it is about time we focus on the real issue around here, and that is to get the authorizations in in time so that the appropriation requests are based upon that.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman forgets that the House Budget Committee is the one that sets the standards for the expenditures of all of the committees and the Budget Committee, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated, has been the real problem. We do not get a chance to know what the figure is from the Budget Committee until March or the middle of April.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Well, the gentleman is talking about setting the limits for the expenditures. The gentleman is not dealing with the limits for expenditures, you are dealing with the guidelines for the Defense Department. That is the problem. You cannot deal with appropriations in an authorization bill. It ought to be separate.

We ought to have to go by the guidelines in the authorization bill and you leave the appropriations to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. STRATTON. We have the same guidelines you have.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of House Joint Resolution 751, and that I may include tabular and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit with instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of California moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 751 to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to that committee to report the joint resolution back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment: In line 5, strike "October 15" and insert in lieu thereof "October 11".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] wish to debate his motion?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I do not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage of the joint resolution. Members will record their votes by electronic device.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 158, nays 222, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

YEAS—158

Archer	Burton (IN)	Conte
Armey	Callahan	Coughlin
Badham	Carney	Courter
Barton	Chandler	Craig
Bateman	Chapple	Dannemeyer
Bereuter	Cheney	Daub
Berman	Clinger	Davis
Billrakis	Coats	DeLay
Bliley	Cobey	DeWine
Boehlert	Coble	Dickinson
Boulter	Coleman (MO)	DioGuardi
Brown (CO)	Combest	Dornan (CA)

Dreier	Lowry (WA)	Rowland (CT)	Oxley	Shelby	Udall	Durbin	Lehman (CA)	Roybal
Duncan	Lujan	Saxton	Panetta	Sikorski	Valentine	Dwyer	Lehman (FL)	Sabo
Eckert (NY)	Lungren	Schaefer	Pease	Slitsky	Vento	Dymally	Leland	Savage
Emerson	Mack	Schneider	Penny	Skelton	Visclosky	Dyson	Levin (MI)	Saxton
Evans (IA)	Madigan	Sensenbrenner	Pepper	Slattery	Volkmer	Edwards (CA)	Levine (CA)	Scheuer
Fawell	Marlenee	Shaw	Perkins	Smith (FL)	Walden	English	Lloyd	Schneider
Fiedler	Martin (IL)	Shumway	Rangel	Smith (IA)	Walgren	Erdreich	Loeffler	Schuette
Fields	Martin (NY)	Shuster	Reid	Smith (NE)	Watkins	Evans (IL)	Long	Schumer
Fish	McCandless	Siljander	Richardson	Solarz	Waxman	Fascell	Lowry (WA)	Seiberling
Franklin	McDade	Skeen	Rodino	Spratt	Weaver	Fazio	Luken	Sharp
Frenzel	McEwen	Slaughter	Roe	St Germain	Wheat	Feighan	Lundine	Sisisky
Gallo	McGrath	Smith (NJ)	Rose	Staggers	Whitley	Fish	Madigan	Skeen
Gekas	McKernan	Smith, Denny	Rostenkowski	Stallings	Whitten	Filippo	Manton	Skelton
Gilman	McKinney	(OR)	Rowland (GA)	Stark	Williams	Florio	Markey	Slaughter
Gingrich	McMillan	Smith, Robert	Roybal	Studds	Wise	Foglietta	Martinez	Smith (FL)
Gradison	Meyers	(NH)	Sabo	Swift	Wolpe	Foley	Matsui	Smith (IA)
Green	Michel	Smith, Robert	Savage	Synar	Wright	Ford (MI)	Mavroules	Smith (NE)
Gregg	Miller (WA)	(OR)	Scheuer	Tallon	Wyden	Ford (TN)	Mazzoli	Smith (NJ)
Gunderson	Molinar	Snowe	Schroeder	Thomas (GA)	Wyllie	Frank	McCloskey	Solarz
Hall, Ralph	Monson	Solomon	Schuette	Torres	Yates	Frost	McDade	Spratt
Hammerschmidt	Moorhead	Spence	Schumer	Torricelli	Yatron	Garcia	McHugh	St Germain
Hansen	Morrison (WA)	Stangeland	Seiberling	Towns	Young (AK)	Gaydos	McKinney	Staggers
Hendon	Nielson	Stenholm	Sharp	Traficant	Young (MO)	Gejdenson	McMillan	Stark
Henry	Packard	Strang				Gephardt	Mica	Stratton
Hiler	Parris	Stratton				Gibbons	Mikulski	Studds
Hopkins	Pashayan	Stump	Andrews	Hartnett	Nichols	Glickman	Miller (CA)	Swift
Hunter	Petri	Sundquist	Bartlett	Hillis	Olin	Gonzalez	Miller (OH)	Synar
Ireland	Pickle	Sweeney	Bentley	Holt	Owens	Goodling	Mineta	Tallon
Jeffords	Porter	Swindall	Boland	Jones (OK)	Price	Gordon	Mollohan	Tauzin
Johnson	Pursell	Tauzin	Boucher	Kaptur	Rahall	Gradison	Montgomery	Taylor
Kemp	Quillen	Taylor	Breaux	Kindness	Rudd	Gray (IL)	Moody	Thomas (GA)
Kramer	Ray	Thomas (CA)	Brooks	Kolbe	Russo	Gray (PA)	Morrison (CT)	Torres
Lagomarsino	Regula	Vander Jagt	Burton (CA)	Kostmayer	Schulze	Green	Mrazek	Torricelli
Leach (IA)	Ridge	Vucanovich	Campbell	Latta	Snyder	Guarini	Murphy	Towns
Lent	Rinaldo	Walker	Conyers	Leland	Stokes	Hamilton	Murtha	Udall
Lewis (CA)	Ritter	Weber	Daniel	Lipinski	Tauke	Hatcher	Myers	Valentine
Lewis (FL)	Roberts	Whittaker	Early	MacKay	Traxler	Hawkins	Natcher	Vander Jagt
Livingston	Robinson	Wirth	Edgar	Martinez	Weiss	Hayes	Neal	Vento
Lloyd	Roemer	Wolf	Edwards (OK)	McCain	Whitehurst	Hefner	Nelson	Visclosky
Loeffler	Rogers	Wortley	Powder	McCollum	Wilson	Hendon	Nowak	Volkmer
Lott	Roth	Young (FL)	Fuqua	McCurdy	Zschau	Hertel	Oakar	Walden
Lowery (CA)	Roukema		Grotberg	Mitchell		Horton	Oberstar	Walgren
			Hall (OH)	Moore		Howard	Obey	Watkins
						Hoyer	Ortiz	Waxman
						Huckaby	Panetta	Weaver
						Hughes	Parris	Wheat
						Hutto	Pease	Whitley
						Jacobs	Pepper	Whitten
						Jeffords	Perkins	Williams
						Jenkins	Quillen	Wise
						Jones (NC)	Rangel	Wolf
						Jones (TN)	Reid	Wolpe
						Kanjorski	Richardson	Wright
						Kastenmeier	Rinaldo	Wyden
						Kennelly	Ritter	Yates
						Kildee	Rodino	Yatron
						Kleczka	Roe	Young (AK)
						Kolter	Rogers	Young (FL)
						LaFalce	Rose	Young (MO)
						Lantos	Rostenkowski	
						Leath (TX)	Rowland (GA)	

NOT VOTING—52

Andrews	Hartnett	Nichols
Bartlett	Hillis	Olin
Bentley	Holt	Owens
Boland	Jones (OK)	Price
Boucher	Kaptur	Rahall
Breaux	Kindness	Rudd
Brooks	Kolbe	Russo
Burton (CA)	Kostmayer	Schulze
Campbell	Latta	Snyder
Conyers	Leland	Stokes
Daniel	Lipinski	Tauke
Early	MacKay	Traxler
Edgar	Martinez	Weiss
Edwards (OK)	McCain	Whitehurst
Fowler	McCollum	Wilson
Fuqua	McCurdy	Zschau
Grotberg	Mitchell	
Hall (OH)	Moore	

□ 1145

Mr. FEIGHAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUI). The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the members that this will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 143, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

AYES—235

Abercrombie	Bevill	Clay
Ackerman	Biaggi	Coelho
Akaka	Bliley	Coleman (TX)
Alexander	Boggs	Collins
Anderson	Boner (TN)	Conte
Annuizio	Bonior (MI)	Cooper
Bonker	Bonker	Coyne
Borski	Borski	Darden
Bosco	Bosco	de la Garza
Boxer	Boulter	Dellums
Broomfield	Boxer	Derrick
Brown (CA)	Brown (CA)	Dingell
Bruce	Bryant	DioGuardi
Bryant	Bustamante	Dixon
Bustamante	Carper	Donnelly
Byron	Carr	Dorgan (ND)
Carper	Chapman	Dowdy
Carr	Chappell	Downey
Chapman		
Chappell		
Clay		
Coelho		
Coleman (TX)		
Collins		
Cooper		
Coyne		
Crane		
Crockett		
Darden		
Daschle		
de la Garza		
Dellums		
Derrick		
Dicks		
Dingell		
Dixon		
Dowdy		
Downey		
Dreier		
Duncan		
Eckert (NY)		
Emerson		
Evans (IA)		
Fawell		
Fiedler		
Fields		
Fish		
Florence		
Ford (MI)		
Ford (TN)		
Frank		
Frost		
Garcia		
Gaydos		
Gejdenson		
Gephardt		
Gibbons		
Glickman		
Gonzalez		
Goodling		
Gordon		
Gray (IL)		
Gray (PA)		
Guarini		
Hamilton		
Hatcher		
Hawkins		
Hayes		
Hefner		
Hertel		
Horton		
Howard		
Hoyer		
Hubbard		
Huckaby		
Hughes		
Hutto		
Hyde		
Jacobs		
Jenkins		
Jones (NC)		
Jones (TN)		
Kanjorski		
Kasich		
Kastenmeier		
Kennelly		
Kildee		
Kleczka		
Kolter		
LaFalce		
Lantos		
Leath (TX)		
Lehman (CA)		
Lehman (FL)		
Levin (MI)		
Levine (CA)		
Lightfoot		
Long		
Luken		
Lundine		
Manton		
Markey		
Matsui		
Mavroules		
Mazzoli		
McCloskey		
McHugh		
Mica		
Mikulski		
Miller (CA)		
Miller (OH)		
Mineta		
Moakley		
Mollohan		
Montgomery		
Moody		
Morrison (CT)		
Mrazek		
Murphy		
Murtha		
Myers		
Natcher		
Neal		
Nelson		
Nowak		
Oakar		
Oberstar		
Obey		
Ortiz		
Panetta		
Parris		
Pease		
Pepper		
Perkins		
Quillen		
Rangel		
Reid		
Richardson		
Rinaldo		
Ritter		
Rodino		
Roe		
Rogers		
Rose		
Rostenkowski		
Rowland (GA)		
Sabo		
Savage		
Saxton		
Scheuer		
Schneider		
Schuette		
Schumer		
Seiberling		
Solarz		
Spratt		
St Germain		
Staggers		
Stark		
Stratton		
Studds		
Swift		
Synar		
Tallon		
Tauzin		
Taylor		
Thomas (GA)		
Torres		
Torricelli		
Towns		
Udall		
Valentine		
Vander Jagt		
Vento		
Visclosky		
Volkmer		
Walden		
Walgren		
Watkins		
Waxman		
Weaver		
Wheat		
Whitley		
Whitten		
Williams		
Wise		
Wolf		
Wolpe		
Wright		
Wyden		
Yates		
Yatron		
Young (AK)		
Young (FL)		
Young (MO)		

NOES—143

Archer	Davis	Johnson
Armey	DeLay	Kasich
Badham	DeWine	Kemp
Barton	Dickinson	Kramer
Bates	Dornan (CA)	Lagomarsino
Bereuter	Dreier	Leach (IA)
Bilirakis	Duncan	Lent
Boehert	Eckart (OH)	Lewis (CA)
Broomfield	Eckert (NY)	Lewis (FL)
Brown (CO)	Emerson	Lightfoot
Bruce	Evans (IA)	Livingston
Burton (IN)	Fawell	Lott
Byron	Fiedler	Lowery (CA)
Callahan	Fields	Lungren
Carney	Franklin	Mack
Chandler	Frenzel	Marlenee
Chappie	Gallo	Martin (IL)
Cheney	Gekas	Martin (NY)
Clinger	Gilman	McCandless
Coats	Gingrich	McEwen
Cobey	Gregg	McGrath
Coble	Gunderson	McKernan
Coleman (MO)	Hall, Ralph	Meyers
Combust	Hammerschmidt	Michel
Coughlin	Hansen	Miller (WA)
Courter	Henry	Molinar
Craig	Hiler	Monson
Crane	Hopkins	Moorhead
Crockett	Hubbard	Morrison (WA)
Dannemeyer	Hunter	Nielson
Daschle	Hyde	Oxley
Daub	Ireland	Packard

Pashayan	Sensenbrenner	Stallings
Penny	Shaw	Stangeland
Petri	Shelby	Stenholm
Pickle	Shumway	Strang
Porter	Shuster	Stump
Pursell	Sikorski	Sundquist
Ray	Siljander	Swindall
Regula	Slattery	Thomas (CA)
Ridge	Smith, Denny	Trafficant
Roberts	(OR)	Vucanovich
Robinson	Smith, Robert	Walker
Roemer	(NH)	Weber
Roth	Smith, Robert	Whittaker
Roukema	(OR)	Wirth
Rowland (CT)	Snowe	Wortley
Schaefer	Solomon	Wyle
Schroeder	Spence	

NOT VOTING—54

Andrews	Hall (OH)	Moore
Bartlett	Hartnett	Nichols
Bentley	Hillis	Olin
Boland	Holt	Owens
Boucher	Jones (OK)	Price
Breaux	Kaptur	Rahall
Brooks	Kindness	Rudd
Burton (CA)	Kolbe	Russo
Campbell	Kostmayer	Schulze
Conyers	Latta	Snyder
Daniel	Lipinski	Stokes
Dicks	Lujan	Sweeney
Early	MacKay	Tauke
Edgar	McCaIn	Traxler
Edwards (OK)	McCollum	Weiss
Fowler	McCurdy	Whitehurst
Fuqua	Mitchell	Wilson
Grotberg	Moakley	Zschau

□ 1155

Mr. COBLE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING EXCLUSION FROM FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX OF WAGES PAID TO CERTAIN ALIEN FARMWORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of passage of the bill (H.R. 5679) to extend the exclusion from Federal unemployment tax of wages paid to certain alien farmworkers, on which further proceedings were postponed on Thursday, October 9, 1986.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1987

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4354) to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal year 1987, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "National Bureau of Standards Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987".

AUTHORIZATION FOR PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

SEC. 2. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") for fiscal year 1987, to carry out the activities performed by the National Bureau of Standards, the sums set forth in the following line items:

(1) Measurement research and Standards, \$36,582,000;

(2) Materials Science and Engineering, \$21,228,000;

(3) Engineering Measurements and Standards, \$35,875,000;

(4) Computer Science and Technology, \$7,500,000; and

(5) Research Support Activities, \$22,768,000.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act—

(1) of the amounts authorized under subsection (a), \$1,900,000 is authorized only for steel technology;

(2) of the amount authorized under paragraph (3) of subsection (a), \$3,470,000 is authorized only for the Center for Building Technology and \$5,402,000 is authorized only for the Center for Fire Research;

(3) of the amount authorized under paragraph (4) of subsection (a), \$1,000,000 is authorized only for Computer Security Activities;

(4) of the amount authorized under paragraph (5) of subsection (a), \$6,763,000 is authorized only for the Technical Competence Fund; and

(5) of the amount authorized under paragraph (5) of subsection (a), \$6,500,000 is authorized only for the design, equipment, and construction of the Cold Neutron Research Facility.

(c)(1) Funds may be transferred among the line items listed in subsection (a) so long as the net funds transferred to or from any line item do not exceed 10 percent of the amount authorized for that line item in each subsection.

(2) In addition, the Secretary may propose transfers to or from any line item exceeding 10 percent of the amount authorized for that line item in subsection (a); but a full and complete explanation of any such proposed transfer and the reason therefor must be transmitted in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate authorizing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the proposed transfer may be made only when thirty calendar days have passed after the transmission of such written explanation.

(d) The National Bureau of Standards shall seek reimbursements of not less than \$500,000 from other Federal agencies to expand its efforts in support of basic scientific research on the atmospheric, climatic, and environmental consequences of nuclear explosions and nuclear exchanges.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTIVITY, TECHNOLOGY, AND INNOVATION

SEC. 3. In addition to the sums authorized by section 2, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1987 the sum of \$2,248,000 for the activities of the Office of Productivity, Technology, and Innovation.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE

SEC. 4. In addition to the sums authorized by sections 2 and 3, there is authorized to the Secretary for fiscal year 1987 the sum of \$500,000 for the patent licensing activities of the National Technical Information Service.

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. Appropriations made under the authority provided in this Act shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure for periods specified in the Acts making such appropriations.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 6. (a) In order to secure the services of the broadest possible range of talent in carrying out the programs of the National Bureau of Standards, the Act of March 3, 1901 (15 U.S.C. 271-278h) is amended by redesignating section 18 as section 19 and by inserting after section 17 the following new section:

"Sec. 18. The Director is authorized to expend up to 1 per centum of the funds appropriated for activities of the National Bureau of Standards in any fiscal year, as the Director may deem desirable, for awards of research fellowships and other forms of financial assistance to students at institutions of higher learning within the United States who show promise as present or future contributors to the mission of the Bureau. The selection of persons to receive such fellowships and assistance shall be made on the basis of ability and of the relevance of the proposed work to the mission and programs of the Bureau."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective October 1, 1986.

ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES REQUIRING RESEARCH IN METROLOGY

SEC. 7. The Board of Assessment of the National Bureau of Standards programs shall include, as part of its annual review, an assessment of emerging technologies which are expected to require research in metrology to keep the Bureau abreast of its mission, including (but not limited to) Process and Quality Control, Technology Transfer, Engineering Databases, High-Performance Composites, Advanced Ceramics, Fiber Optics, Microwave Metrology, Bioprocess Engineering, and Advanced Computing Concepts. Such review shall include estimates of the cost of the required effort, that required staffing level, and the period over which the research will be required.

POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

SEC. 8. (a) The Act of March 3, 1901 (15 U.S.C. 271-271h), as amended by section 6 of this Act, is further amended by redesignating section 19 as section 20 and by inserting after section 18 the following new section:

"Sec. 19. The National Bureau of Standards, in conjunction with the National Academy of Sciences, shall establish and conduct a post-doctoral fellowship program which shall be organized and carried out in substantially the same manner as the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council Post-Doctoral Research Associate Program that was in effect prior to 1986, and which shall include not less than twenty nor more than forty new fellows per fiscal year."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective October 1, 1987.

PROCESS AND QUALITY CONTROL AND
CALIBRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 9. (a) The Director of the National Bureau of Standards shall hold discussions with representatives of Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Institutes of Health, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission which use (or the contractors of which depend on) the process and quality control and calibration programs of the Bureau, and with companies, organizations, and major engineering societies from the private sector, in order to determine the extent of the demand for research and services under such programs, the appropriate methods of paying for research and services under such programs, and the willingness of Federal agencies and the private sector to pay for such research and services.

(b) Within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report of the Director's findings based on the discussions held under subsection (a), together with recommendations for such legislative actions as may be needed to implement a comprehensive Federal process and quality control and calibration program.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT RELATING TO
PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

SEC. 10. (a)(1) The Office of Personnel Management and the National Bureau of Standards shall jointly design a demonstration project which shall be conducted by the Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

(2) The demonstration project shall, except as otherwise provided in this section, be conducted in accordance with section 4703 of title 5, United States Code, and shall be counted as a single project for purposes of subsection (d)(2) of such section.

(3) Subject to subsections (f) and (g) of section 4703 of title 5, United States Code, the demonstration project shall cover any position within the National Bureau of Standards which would otherwise be subject to—

(A) subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the General Schedule;

(B) subchapter VIII of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the Senior Executive Service; or

(C) chapter 54 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the Performance Management and Recognition System.

(b) Under the demonstration project, the Director of the National Bureau of Standards shall provide that—

(1) the rate of basic pay for a position may not be less than the minimum rate of basic pay, nor more than the maximum rate of basic pay, payable for the pay band (as referred to in paragraph 3)) within which such position has been placed;

(2) the minimum and maximum rates of basic pay for each pay band shall be adjusted at the times, and by the amounts, provided for under subsection (c);

(3) positions shall be classified under a system using pay bands which shall be established by combining or otherwise modifying the classes, grades, or other units which would otherwise be used in classifying the positions involved;

(4) employees shall be evaluated under a performance appraisal system which—

(A) uses peer comparison and ranking wherever appropriate; and

(B) affords appeal rights comparable to those afforded under chapter 43 of title 5, United States Code;

(5)(A) the rate of basic pay of each participating employee will be reviewed annually, and shall be adjusted on the basis of the appraised performance of the employee; and

(B) subject to subsection (c)(4)(A)(i), the adjustment under subparagraph (A) in any year in the case of any employee whose performance is rated at the fully successful level or higher shall be at least the percentage adjustment taking effect under subsection (c) (3) in such year;

(6) appropriate supervisory and managerial pay differentials (which shall be considered a part of basic pay) shall be provided;

(7) performance-recognition bonuses, and recruitment and retention allowances, shall be awarded in appropriate circumstances (but shall not be considered a part of basic pay);

(8) there shall be an employee development program which includes provisions under which employees may, in appropriate circumstances, be granted sabbaticals, the terms and conditions of which shall be consistent with those applicable for members of the Senior Executive Service under section 3396(c) of title 5, United States Code (excluding paragraph (2)(B) thereof);

(9) payment of travel expenses shall be provided for personnel to their first post of duty in the same manner as is authorized for members of the Senior Executive Service under section 5723 of title 5, United States Code, at the discretion of the Director; and

(10) the methods of establishing qualification requirements for, recruitment for, and appointment to positions shall, at the discretion of the Director, include methods involving direct examination and hiring.

(c)(1) For the purpose of this subsection, the term "compensation" means the total value of the various forms of compensation provided, including—

- (A) basic pay;
- (B) bonuses;
- (C) allowances;
- (D) retirement benefits;
- (E) health insurance benefits;
- (F) life insurance benefits; and
- (G) leave benefits.

(2) The Director of the National Bureau of Standards shall, by contract or otherwise, provide for the preparation of reports which, based on appropriate surveys—

(A) shall include findings as to—

(i) the extent to which, as of the commencement of the demonstration project, the overall average level of compensation provided with respect to positions under the demonstration project is deficient in comparison to the overall average level of compensation generally provided with respect to positions involving the same types and levels of work in the private sector; and

(ii) with respect to each year thereafter, any net increase occurring during such year in the extent of the deficiency in the overall average level of compensation provided with respect to positions under the demonstration project, as compared to the overall average level of compensation generally provided with respect to positions involving the same types and levels of work in the private sector; and

(B) shall recommend a single percentage by which basic pay for all positions under

the demonstration project must be increased so that, when considered in conjunction with the other forms of compensation generally provided, any net increases determined under subparagraph (A)(ii) will be eliminated.

(3) Whenever the Director of the National Bureau of Standards receives a recommendation under paragraph (2)(B), the Director—

(A) shall increase the minimum and maximum rates of basic pay for each such pay band by the lesser of—

- (i) the percentage recommended; or
- (ii) the overall average percentage of the adjustment in the rates of pay under the General Schedule under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, for the period involved; and

(B) if and to the extent that funds are available for the purpose, may further increase those minimum and maximum rates—

(i) to make up for any part of the difference between the respective percentages under subparagraph (A), if the percentage under subparagraph (A)(ii) is the lesser; and

(ii) after making up for the entirety of any difference determined under clause (i) (including from any previous year), to eliminate any part of any remaining deficiency as originally determined under paragraph (2)(A)(i).

(4)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section—

(i) the maximum rate of basic pay payable under any pay band may not exceed the rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule; and

(ii) the amount of basic pay, bonuses, and allowances paid during any fiscal year to any employee participating in the demonstration project may not, in the aggregate, exceed the annual rate of basic pay payable for level I of the Executive Schedule.

(B)(i) Any amount which is not paid to an employee during a fiscal year because of the limitation under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be paid in a lump sum at the beginning of the following fiscal year.

(ii) Any amount paid under this subparagraph during a fiscal year shall be taken into account for purposes of applying the limitation under subparagraph (A)(ii) with respect to such fiscal year.

(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the demonstration project shall be conducted in such a way so that, with respect to the 12-month period beginning on October 1, 1986, the total cost to the Government relating to providing compensation to participating employees shall not exceed the total cost which would have resulted if this section had not been enacted.

(6)(A) If the minimum rate of basic pay for a pay band, after an increase under paragraph (3)(A), exceeds the rate of basic pay payable to an employee whose position would otherwise be within such pay band, the employee's position may, notwithstanding subsection (b)(1), be placed in the next lower pay band.

(B) Placement of a position in a lower pay band under subparagraph (A) shall not be considered a reduction in grade or pay for purposes of subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, or a comparable provision under the project.

(d)(1) The rate of basic pay for an employee serving in a position at the time it is converted to a position covered by the demonstration project may not be reduced by reason of the establishment of such project.

(2)(A) Each employee referred to in paragraph (1) shall be paid—

(i) in the case of an employee serving in a position under the General Schedule on the date the position becomes covered by the demonstration project, a lump-sum pro rata share of the equivalent of any within-grade increase which would have been due the employee under section 5335 of title 5, United States Code, computed as provided in subparagraph (B), and

(ii) in the case of an employee serving in a position subject to chapter 54 of title 5, United States Code, on such date, a lump-sum pro rata share of the equivalent of the employee's merit increase which would have been due under such chapter, computed as provided in subparagraph (B), taking into account the performance requirements applicable to such increase.

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the pro rata share of an equivalent increase referred to in such subparagraph shall be computed through the day before the date referred to in such subparagraph.

(e)(1)(A) In carrying out section 4703(h) of title 5, United States Code, with respect to the demonstration project, the Office of Personnel Management shall provide that such project will be evaluated on an annual basis by a contractor. Such contractor shall be especially qualified to perform the evaluation based on its expertise in matters relating to personnel management and compensation.

(B) The contractor shall report its findings to the Office in writing. After considering the report, the Office shall transmit a copy of the report, together with any comments of the Office and any comments submitted by the National Bureau of Standards, to—

(i) the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the Committee on Science and Technology, of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, of the Senate.

(2) The Comptroller General shall, not later than 4 years after the date on which the demonstration project commences, submit to each of the committees referred to in paragraph (1)(B) a final report concerning such project. Such report shall include any recommendations for legislation or other action which the Comptroller General consider appropriate.

(f) The authority to enter into any contract under this section may be exercised only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts.

(g) The demonstration project shall commence not later than January 1, 1988.

Mr. WALGREN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we had hoped that some of these things would not get in the way of what is another potential vote, but since it has been brought up, I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN] for a very short explanation of the bill.

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is the authorization for the National Bureau of Standards that has been worked out with the Senate and the Committee on Science and Technology.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt H.R. 4354. The measure before us incorporates funding levels agreed to by the House and Senate authorizing committees, and the administration through the Office of Management and Budget.

Although there remains broad agreement that the National Bureau of Standards is deeply underfunded when measured either by historical standards or the breadth of its mission, the agreement reached in this bill is worth supporting because it will put an end to a destructive philosophical disagreement between the Congress and the administration over a number of activities at the Bureau of Standards. This conflict has had a devastating impact on the morale of the critical Bureau programs in fire and building research as well as the Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology. It also has delayed unreasonably the construction of the cold neutro source facility which will instantly transform NBS into a world-class materials research center.

As is clear from the three letters I am submitting for the RECORD along with the written statement of Congressman FUQUA, the compromise contains the following elements:

Total funding at the President's request—\$123,953,000—which is only \$32,000 below the original House-passed authorization.

Reductions of \$500,000 each in funding for the Center for Fire Research and the Center for Building Technology, which is a total cut of over 10 percent in funding for these Centers. The administration had sought originally to eliminate the Centers. The original House and Senate bills retained current funding.

A reduction of \$2.5 million or about 25 percent for the Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology. The administration had sought originally a cut of about \$5.0 million from recent levels. The original House and Senate bills retained current funding. This cut would be directed at the Open Systems Interconnection Program of ICST, because the private sector is greatly expanding its efforts in this area.

Provide funding of \$6.5 million to begin construction of the Cold Neutron Research Facility, which is just enough to commit to construction at full scale. The administration had sought originally \$10 million. The original House bill authorized "such sums"; the Senate bill made no mention of the project and the project was unlikely to start absent this compromise.

In return, the Office of Management and Budget has agreed to:

Propose no further cuts in fire, building, or computer science programs for the remainder of this administration.

Propose no reorganization of the Fire and Building Centers.

Treat the fire, building, and computer science programs identically to all other NBS programs.

The NBS bill continues to:

Fund new initiatives in ceramics, fiber optics, and scientific computing.

Permit the NBS Director to establish a China Lake-style salary experiment for 5 years.

The debate over NBS has been grueling for all parties, but we believe we have reached an agreement that simultaneously secures the future of the fire, building, and computer programs, and allows construction of the Cold Neutron Facility.

It should be stressed that this agreement in no way indicates any diminution in congressional support for the Center for Fire Research, the Center for Building Technology, and the Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology. Reluctantly, we accepted a final reduction in the Center's budget to secure their long-term prospects, to free them from a morale destroying stepchild existence and to free up money for the Cold Neutron Facility, which we have long supported in principle. We trust that these parts of the Bureau will now remain with equal status with the rest of the Bureau, that they will be able to put forth new initiatives on a par with the rest of the Bureau, and in time regain their former health, size, and strength.

NBS is too valuable to be lost, partially eliminated, or left unstable. This bill, while far from perfect from any vantage point, gives us a chance to end past disagreements in a way that has short- and long-term benefits for one of the Government's true national treasures. I urge my colleagues to look at the immense benefits of passing this legislation that far outweigh the short-term setbacks the bill of necessity contains and join me in giving their wholehearted support to what without exaggeration can be termed landmark legislation for the agency it authorizes.

I urge my colleagues to send H.R. 4354 on to the President.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 30, 1986.

Hon. DOUG WALGREN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR Mr. WALGREN: This is to confirm recent staff discussions on the National Bureau of Standards (NBS) authorization and appropriation bills.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Department of Commerce will support a total NBS budget authorization of \$123,953,000 for FY 1987. This level will include \$6.5 Million for initiation of the Cold Neutron Facility and reductions from the pre Gramm-Rudman-Hollings FY 1986 operating levels of \$5 Million for the Fire Program, \$.5 Million for the Building Program and \$2.5 Million for Computer Sciences and Technology. There will also be reductions of \$1.5 Million in the Competence Program and \$1.641 Million in the Post Doctoral Program. Neither the Department of Commerce nor OMB will propose further programmatic reductions in the Fire, Building, and Computer Sciences Programs in FY 1987, FY 1988 or FY 1989. In the case of across-the-board budget changes such as reductions the President must make to achieve Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit targets or a subsequent sequester, these programs will be treated the same as the other NBS programs.

Our commitment is, of course, contingent on successful implementation of this compromise in both the final authorization and appropriation for NBS in FY 1987.

Sincerely,

CAROL T. CRAWFORD,
Associate Director for
Economics and Government.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, September 30, 1986.

Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Deputy Secretary,
U.S. Department of Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BUD: We want to thank you for your efforts toward reaching a compromise on the budget for the National Bureau of Standards (NBS). Without your persistence and determination, this agreement could never have been negotiated.

The debate over NBS has been grueling for all parties, but we believe we have reached an agreement that simultaneously secures the future of the fire, building and computer programs, and allows construction of the cold neutron facility.

We want to stress that this agreement in no way indicates any diminution in Congressional support for either the Center for Fire Research or the Center for Building Technology. We reluctantly accepted a final reduction in the Centers' budgets to secure their long-term prospects and to free up money for the cold neutron facility, which we have long supported in principle. Again, this decision to accept the compromise represents absolutely no change whatsoever in Congressional policy.

Indeed, we expect the position of the Centers to improve. The Administration has pledged that the Centers will henceforth be on equal footing with all other NBS divisions. They will be eligible for competence fund money and any proposed new initiative will be given fair and thorough consideration. They will receive annual adjustments to base and increase for inflation on a par with all other sections of NBS. The Administration has also pledged not to merge or reorganize the two Centers through FY 1989.

These understandings, along with the guarantee that no further budget cuts will be proposed for the Centers for the remainder of this Administration, should give the two Centers the long-sought stability they need to function properly.

There are no contingencies in this agreement, no escape clauses; the guarantees must be iron-clad.

This agreement should be a great step forward for the entire Bureau. With this dispute behind us at long last, we look forward to working with you to build the Bureau to proper strength.

This is a goal we all share. Your ability to hammer out this difficult agreement should bode well for our future endeavors.

With warmest regards,
Sincerely,

DOUG WALGREN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology.

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,
Ranking Republican Member, Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 1986.

Hon. JAMES MILLER,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Executive Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MILLER: We want to clarify the agreement of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and our Committees have reached on the budget for the National Bureau of Standards.

In keeping with this agreement, our authorization bill for Fiscal Year 1987 will provide:

	Million
Measurement, research and standards.....	\$36.582
Materials science and engineering.....	21.228
Engineering measurement and standards.....	35.875
Institute for computer sciences & tech.....	7.500
Research support activities.....	22.768
Total.....	123,953

These figures include:

Center for Fire Research	5.402
Center for Building Technology.....	3.470
Competence Fund	6.763
Cold Neutron Research Facility	6.500

In exchange for our agreeing to make these budget changes, the Office of Management and Budget promises not to propose any further cuts in fire, building or computer science in FY 1987, 1988 and 1989. Furthermore, these programs will be treated like any other NBS program.

The appropriations bill must also have the agreed upon cuts in fire, building and computer sciences, and initial funding for the Cold Neutron Research Facility, for this agreement to take effect.

We are pleased we have been able to reach this agreement.

With warmest regards,
Sincerely,

John C. Danforth, Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation; Ernest F. Hollings, Ranking Democrat, Senate Committee on Commerce Science and Transportation; Slade Gorton, Chairman, Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space; Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Ranking Democrat, Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space.

Don Fuqua, Chairman, House Committee on Science and Technology; Manuel Lujan, Jr., Ranking Republican Member, House Committee on Science and Technology; Doug Walgren, Chairman, Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology; Sherwood Boehlert, Ranking Republican Member, Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology.

Mr. WALKER, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, this has been cleared by everyone; is that correct?

Mr. WALGREN. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there should be no objection to this bill.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill before us today, which represents an agreement between the House Committee on Science and Technology and the Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

The agreement provides total funding at the President's request level of \$123,953,000. In fact, the total is slightly below the original House and Senate levels and the pre-Gramm-Rudman 1986 budget.

The amounts contained in this bill will permit the NBS to fund new initiatives in ceramics, fiber optics, and scientific computing.

I am also very pleased that the other body has agreed to accept the personnel system amendment contained in the House bill. This will permit the NBS Director to establish an agencywide demonstration of a flexible salary and pay board system, modeled on the recommendations of the Federal Laboratory Review Panel of the White House Science Council which was chaired by David Packard.

For the last 5 years, I have worked with my colleagues on the House Science Committee to overturn administration proposals to either eliminate or cut the heart out of the fire and building centers and the Institute for Computer Science and Technology.

I am pleased to be able to report that the bill contains language acceptable to the OMB which finally resolves these issues.

Specifically, the agreement includes the following:

Cuts in funding for the Center for Fire Research and the Center for Building Technology of \$500,000 each. The administration had sought originally to eliminate the centers. The original House and Senate bills retained current funding.

A cut in funding for the Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology of \$2.5 million. The administration had sought originally a cut of about \$5.0 million from historic levels. The original House and Senate bills retained current funding.

Funding of \$6.5 million to begin construction of the Cold Neutron Research Facility. The administration had sought originally \$10 million. The original House bill authorized "such sums;" the Senate bill made no mention of the project.

In return, the Office of Management and Budget has agreed to:

Propose no further cuts in fire, building or computer science programs for the remainder of this administration.

Propose no reorganization of the fire and building centers.

Treat the fire, building and computer sciences programs identically to all other NBS programs.

I want to make it clear for the record that the acceptance of these cuts does not represent a shift in congressional support for NBS's fire, building, and computer programs. Rather, as we stated in a letter to OMB Director, Jim Miller and Deputy Commerce Secretary, Bud Brown, these cuts were accepted with the main goal of bringing long-range stability to these programs.

Finally, within these austere budget times, we have worked to come up with a bill that provides stability to ongoing programs and funds important new initiatives.

I urge my colleagues to accept the agreement represented in H.R. 4354 and send it to the President.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a watershed for the National Bureau of Standards. With it, we believe we are putting behind us years of acrimonious, counterproductive wrangling between Congress and the administration that has crippled the Bureau.

While the National Bureau of Standards may be a mystery to many Members of this body, its work is of vital importance to our Nation. The Bureau is the country's oldest national laboratory and the one most responsive to industry.

Its work is critical to maintaining our economic competitiveness. That means jobs. Its work in such areas as computer sciences, fiber optics, and ceramics define the frontiers of research.

An equally important part of the Bureau's mission is work that improves the health and safety of all Americans. This research, performed primarily by the Center for Fire Research and the Center for Building Technology, is indispensable and would not be conducted by any other group or institution.

The agreement between the House Committee on Science and Technology, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation; and the Office of Management and Budget embodied in this bill finally recognizes this dual mission of the National Bureau of Standards.

For the past 5 years, the administration has proposed the elimination of the fire and building centers and Draconian cuts in the Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology [ICST].

With the passage of this bill, the administration has pledged, in writing, not to propose any future cuts whatsoever in those three vital programs. It has further agreed to treat the three centers as equal partners in the Bureau. This should end the uncertainty which has made planning and hiring next to impossible in those programs.

In return for those commitments from OMB, we have agreed to reduce funding for the fire and building centers by \$500,000 each and for computer sciences by \$2.5 million. This money will contribute to the \$6.5 million now authorized for the Cold Neutron Research Facility—A project desperately sought by materials science experts and long supported in principle by the Congress.

I want to emphasize that these cuts were accepted with the greatest reluctance after arduous negotiations for the sole purpose of bringing long-range stability to the affected programs. These cuts do not represent any weakening of congressional support for the Bureau's fire, building, and computer programs, but are designed rather to improve the long-term prospects of those programs. We have made this clear in letters to OMB Director Jim Miller and Deputy Commerce Secretary Bud Brown.

This bill will also improve the future health of the Bureau in some other ways. The committee is extremely proud of the China-Lake style salary system permitted under this bill. The Bureau has had great difficulty attracting and retaining top scientists and engineers because its salaries were significantly below those available in the private sector. This bill

will give management the flexibility it needs to build the best possible research staff.

In short, this bill should put the Bureau back on the road to long-term stability and health. The overall budget for the lab is still woefully low. But within the constraints imposed by the President's budget and the deficit crisis, we have come up with a measure that funds important new initiatives, provides greater management flexibility, and protects vital health and safety programs. The result should be more Americans working—and working and living more safely.

I'd like to thank all the people who made this possible, particularly our subcommittee chairman, DOUG WALGREN, and his Senate counterpart, SLADE GORTON, the Department of Commerce, and the Office of Management and Budget, and the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1205

INDIAN HEALTH CARE AMENDMENTS OF 1985

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1426) to authorize and amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

(For the Senate amendment, see Senate proceedings of October 8, 1986, at page S15572.)

The Clerk read the House amendment to the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike all of section 714 and renumber the succeeding section accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object to concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1426 with a further amendment, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], chairman of the committee, to explain his amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRANG. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the most serious problem on our Indian reservations is health. For 6 years, our committee and the Committee on Energy and Commerce, under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr.

WAXMAN], have tried to find solutions to better the progress toward Indian health.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple, but significant amendment. It strikes a provision added to the bill by the Senate.

There is a growing controversy on the question of whether the responsibility of the Indian Health Service to provide health care to Indians is a primary responsibility or is residual to all other health resources available to Indian people.

The administration's policy is that IHS services are residual.

Others, including certain counties in the State of Montana, have taken the position that IHS services are primary and county health services are residual.

In the 98th Congress, similar legislation was vetoed by the President because of the inclusion of a provision which provided that, in the State of Montana, IHS services are primary and the county services are residual.

A recent decision of the district court in Montana has held that county services are residual to IHS services. The administration has appealed this decision to the circuit court which has stayed the effect of the district court decision.

The Senate amendment would, in effect, circumvent the court's stay and provide that, during the pendency of this litigation, IHS in that judicial district will be considered primary and the counties' services residual.

This administration has made very clear that, if this provision is retained, this very important legislation will, again, be vetoed.

We simply cannot let that happen, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, this amendment will strike that section of the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, 2 years ago, Congress sent to the President a similar bill which the President vetoed. The first provision cited in that statement was the Montana provisions relating to the relationship of the Indian Health Service with that State. Again, the other body, for the sake of one or two individuals, has added to the bill another Montana provision. I have been informed by the administration that inclusion of the Montana provision assures the bill of a veto. I strongly support the chairman's motion to delete this provision and return the bill to the other body. If this needed bill must die, I believe we should place the responsibility where it lies, with the Members of the other body, and not with the President. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a letter from an Indian leader on benefits of tribes, which supports this position. While I do not agree with all the provisions of the bill before us, I be-

lieve on the whole it is a good bill that will benefit Indian tribes and their members. The Indian people are in desperate need of improved health care and H.R. 1426 will go far to assist Indian people.

I would prefer to go to conference on the bill, but it appears that time is running out. I may seek changes in the act in the next Congress. I commend the chairman for his patience in this matter.

WASHOE TRIBE OF
NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA,
Gardnerville, NV, October 7, 1986.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
Committee on Interior Affairs, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCAIN: I respectfully request that you insist on a Conference Committee when the Indian Health Care Amendments bill comes before the House of Representatives.

A Conference Committee is necessary in order to remove the "Montana" provisions from the bill. The Department of Health and Human Services has made their position on Senator Melcher's amendment quite clear: the President will veto the bill if any version of the Montana provisions are contained. Such a veto would be consistent with existing federal Indian policy.

So many people including you, and the tribes, have worked too hard for too many years on this important Indian health legislation to have it jeopardized by the Montana provisions.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. FRANK,
Chairman, Washoe Tribe of
Nevada and California.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

HOULTON BAND OF MALISEET INDIANS SUPPLEMENTARY CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1986

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2750) to establish a property tax fund for the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians in furtherance of the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the legislation?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRANG. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill resolves a problem growing out of the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980.

Under that act, a land acquisition fund of \$900,000 was established for the Houlton Band. However, expenditures from that fund could not be made until the tribe and the State of Maine reached an agreement on the capacity of the tribe to pay taxes or payments in lieu of taxes on lands acquired.

With earned interest, the acquisition fund now totals \$1,800,000. S. 2750 simply directs that \$200,000 of this fund be transferred to a separate fund to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of insuring that such taxes or payments will be made.

Enactment of the bill represents no costs to the United States.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for S. 2750. This bill amends the Maine Indian Land Claims Settlement Act of 1980 in order to establish a tax fund for the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians of Houlton, ME.

I would like to express my appreciation to Mr. UDALL, Mr. STRANG, and Mr. MCCAIN, for their assistance in bringing this measure before the House for consideration.

The tax fund will be used to pay taxes, fees, and payments in lieu of property taxes owed by the band to the State. The fund will be started with \$200,000 of earned interest from the land acquisition fund set up by the Settlement Act. This transfer will not diminish the purchasing power of the acquisition fund, which originally held \$900,000 and now contains \$1.9 million.

The Houlton Band has few economic assets and the purchase of land will allow the band to move forward with their economic development plans. This measure will allow them to complete the purchase of land currently being held in trust by the Government. Without this legislation, the band cannot purchase the land they need to start their reservation.

This bill, which is supported by Maine's entire congressional delegation, is the result of many years of ne-

gotiations between the band and the State of Maine, as a result of the Settlement Act. The Maine State Legislature has passed legislation supporting the establishment of such a fund. S. 2750, also, enjoys the support of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the first step on the band's road to self-sufficiency and I urge its speedy consideration and passage.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2750

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians Supplementary Claims Settlement Act of 1986".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Houlton Band Tax Fund" means the fund established under section 3.

(2) The term "Houlton Band trust land" means land or natural resources acquired by the Secretary of the Interior and held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians in accordance with section 5(d) of the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980 (25 U.S.C. 1724(d); 94 Stat. 1789).

(3) The term "amended Maine Implementing Act" means the Maine Implementing Act (defined in section 3(e) of the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980 (25 U.S.C. 1722(e); 94 Stat. 1787)) as amended by—

(A) the "Act to amend the Maine Implementing Act with respect to the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians", enacted by the State of Maine in chapter 675 of the Public Laws of 1981, and

(B) the State of Maine in chapter 672 of the Public Laws of 1985.

(4) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) The term "Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians" has the meaning given to such term by section 3(a) of the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980 (25 U.S.C. 1722(a)).

HOULTON BAND TAX FUND

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the United States Treasury a fund to be known as the Houlton Band Tax Fund in which shall be deposited \$200,000 in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b)(1) Income accrued on the land acquisition fund established for the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians pursuant to subsections (c) and (d)(1) of section 5 of the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980 (25 U.S.C. 1724; 94 Stat. 1789) shall be transferred to the Houlton Band Tax Fund. No transfer shall be made under this subsection if such transfer would diminish such land acquisition fund to a balance of less than \$900,000.

(2) Whenever funds are transferred to the Houlton Band Tax Fund pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall publish notice of such transfer in the Federal Register. Such notice shall specify when the full

amount of \$20,000 has been transferred to the Houlton Band Tax Fund.

(c) The Secretary shall manage the Houlton Band Tax Fund in accordance with the first section of the Act of June 24, 1938 (25 U.S.C. 162a), and shall utilize the principal and interest of such Fund only as provided in subsection (d) and for no other purpose.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3727 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary shall pay out of the Houlton Band Tax Fund all valid claims for taxes, payments in lieu of property taxes, and fees, together with any interest and penalties thereon—

(1) for which the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians are determined to be liable under the terms of section 6208-A(2) of the amended Maine Implementing Act,

(2) which are final and not subject to further administrative or judicial review, and

(3) which have been certified by the Commissioner of Finance and Administration of the State of Maine as valid claims (within the meaning of section 6208-A(2) of the amended Maine Implementing Act) that meet the requirements of this subsection.

(e) Notwithstanding of any provision of law, if—

(1) the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians is liable to the State of Maine or any county, district, municipality, city, town, village, plantation, or any other political subdivision thereof for any tax, payment in lieu of property tax, or fees, together with any interest or penalties thereon, and

(2) there are insufficient funds in the Houlton Band Tax Fund to pay such tax, payment, or fee (together with any interest or penalties thereon) in full, the deficiency shall be paid by the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians only from income-producing property owned by such Band which is not held in trust for such Band by the United States, and such Band shall not be required to pay such tax, payment, or fee (or any interest or penalty thereon) from any other source.

(f) The Secretary shall, after consultation with the Commissioner of Finance and Administration of the State of Maine and the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians, prescribe written procedures governing the filing and payment of claims under this section and section 6208-A of the amended Maine Implementing Act.

HOULTON BAND TRUST LAND

SEC. 4. (a) Subject to the provisions of section 3 of this Act, the Secretary is authorized and directed to expend, at the request of the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians, the principal of, and income accruing on, the land acquisition fund established for such Band under subsections (c) and (d)(1) of section 5 of the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980 (25 U.S.C. 1724; 94 Stat. 1789) for the purpose of acquiring land or natural resources for such Band and for no other purpose. Land or natural resources so acquired within the State of Maine for such Band shall be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of such Band.

(b)(1) Land or natural resources acquired with funds expended under the authority of subsection (a) and held in trust for the benefit of the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians may be alienated only by—

(A) takings for public use pursuant to the laws of the State of Maine as provided in subsection (c),

(B) takings for public use pursuant to the laws of the United States,

(C) transfers authorized by section 5(g)(3) of the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act

of 1980 (25 U.S.C. 1724(g)(3); 94 Stat. 1791), or

(D) transfers made pursuant to an Act or joint resolution of Congress.

All other transfers of land or natural resources acquired with funds expended under the authority of subsection (a) and held in trust for the benefit of such Band shall be void ab initio and without any validity in law or equity.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall not prohibit or limit transfers of individual use assignments of land or natural resources from one member of the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians to another member of such Band.

(c)(1) Land or natural resources acquired with funds expended under the authority of subsection (a) and held in trust for the benefit of the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians may be condemned for public purposes by the State of Maine, or any political subdivision thereof, only upon such terms and conditions as shall be agreed upon in writing between the State and such Band after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) The consent to the United States is hereby given to the State of Maine to further amend the amended Maine Implementing Act for the purpose of embodying the agreement described in paragraph (1).

(d)(1) Lands and natural resources may be acquired by the Secretary for the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians only if the Secretary has, at any time prior to such acquisition—

(A) transmitted a letter to the Secretary of State of the State of Maine stating that the Houlton Band Tax Fund contains \$200,000, and

(B) provided the Secretary of State of the State of Maine with a copy of the procedures for filing and payment of claims prescribed under section 3(f).

(2)(A) No land or natural resources may be acquired by the Secretary for the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians until the Secretary—

(i) files with the Secretary of State of the State of Maine a certified copy of the deed, contract, or other conveyance setting forth the location and boundaries of the land or natural resources to be acquired by the Secretary, or

(ii) files with the Secretary of State of the State of Maine a certified copy of any instrument setting forth the location and boundaries of the land or natural resources to be acquired.

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), filing with the Secretary of State of the State of Maine may be made by mail and, if such method of filing is used, shall be considered to be completed on the date on which the document is properly mailed to the Secretary of State of the State of Maine.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FORESTS OF NEVADA ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1986

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5277) to transfer certain public lands in Nevada to the Toiyabe, Humboldt, and Inyo National Forests, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Ohio explain what is involved in this legislation?

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute for this bill, which I will offer. The amendment has been cleared with the minority and with the entire delegation from the State of Nevada.

This bill would enact a part of a nationwide interchange of responsibilities between the Federal Government's two principal multiple-use land managing agencies—the U.S. Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior. The idea of that interchange of responsibilities was to increase the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of land management by these two agencies by creating more manageable units and eliminating duplication of services.

This bill would do that in the manner agreed to by the Forest Service, the BLM, the State delegation, and the Governor. While the administration would prefer to our dealing with the entire, nationwide interchange proposal they have proposed, they testified at our hearing on this bill that enacting this bill would have no adverse effect on agency personnel, on agency budgets, or on their ability to carry out their work.

The bill was introduced by Representative HARRY REID for himself and our colleague BARBARA VUCANOVICH, and they have both agreed to the amendment, which consists of technical changes including additional, clarifying language requested by the administration.

In short, I wish to support the efforts of our colleagues HARRY REID

and BARBARA VUCANOVICH in this matter, and I want to congratulate them for working hard to get this matter of great concern to their constituents worked out so that it can be enacted into law in this Congress.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5277, the National Forests of Nevada Enhancement Act of 1986, which I introduced, and is endorsed by the entire Nevada congressional delegation.

The legislation will transfer more than 500,000 acres of Federal lands in Nevada, currently administered by the Bureau of Land Management, to the U.S. Forest Service.

A brief outline of the development of this proposal is warranted. In June 1985, the U.S. Forest Service and the BLM announced a proposal to interchange management of about 30 to 35 million acres of land and underlying minerals. The purpose of the proposed interchange was to improve the management of public lands and national forests, enhance public service, and reduce agency costs.

The proposed "landswap" caused an uproar in Nevada. Under the original plan, Forest Service lands in Nevada would shrink to less than 1 million acres, while the BLM would manage 4.5 million acres. The Departments of Interior and Agriculture also held public hearings in Nevada last summer to gauge the public's sentiments about the landswap. The public hearings brought out near-unanimous opposition to reducing Forest Service lands in the State. Too many serious questions remained; ranging from concerns about agency funding, quality of management, the status of revenues to State and county governments, and possible environmental degradation.

Following public input and further deliberation, the U.S. Forest Service and BLM developed a new interchange proposal affecting 12 Western States and two Eastern cities, allowing Nevada to retain all of its existing National Forests and converts BLM lands to the U.S. Forest Service.

Congressional approval of the omnibus interchange proposal, which shifts 18 million acres of BLM land to the Forest Service and 16 million acres of Forest Service land to the BLM, is not forthcoming. In other words, support for the Federal Lands Administration Act, introduced last spring, is virtually nil.

At the urging of the National Forest Task Force of Nevada, the Nevada delegation introduced this legislation to enlarge and enhance our valuable Forest Service lands. Specifically H.R. 5277 transfers BLM lands to the U.S. Forest Service in the Spring Mountains adjacent to Mount Charleston

and lands in the eastern Sierras. H.R. 5277 also transfers 23,000 acres of Forest Service-administered lands in the Toiyabe National Forest to the Bureau of Land Management.

The National Forests of Nevada Enhancement Act is also supported by the Governor of Nevada, the board of commissioners of Clark County, and the Mount Charleston Town Advisory Board. The transfer does not affect existing water rights, any wilderness review underway by the BLM or the Forest Service, and will not alter the existing division of responsibility for mining activity on Forest Service land.

Aside from the bill's obvious advantages of providing more efficient management and cost savings, I must point out a positive and important benefit. If passed, the National Forests of Nevada Enhancement Act will increase the green on the map of Nevada, adding to our State's image. Our State's natural resources will be improved for the benefit of present and future generations.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on this widely supported proposal.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I simply want to rise in support of H.R. 5277, the National Forests and Public Lands of Nevada Enhancement Act of 1986, as amended. This bill is the result of a united, bipartisan Nevada task force and will facilitate an interchange of lands between the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. The amended bill has the support of the entire Nevada delegation, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, and the BLM and Forest Service.

The purpose of the original omnibus interchange bill, proposed in 1985, was to improve management efficiency of public lands. It also would have virtually eliminated Nevada's two national forests, the Toiyabe and the Humboldt. The citizens of Nevada felt an urgent need to protect and preserve their forests and created the National Forest Task Force of Nevada, of which I am a member, to develop an alternative to the proposed interchange.

Members of the task force came to Washington in January of this year and met with the Nevada delegation, the Forest Service and the BLM. A decision was made at that meeting to add to, rather than subtract from, Nevada's precious national forests. It was also decided at that meeting to add acreage to the BLM from the Forest Service for management efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, the people in Nevada are very supportive of this interchange. They have demonstrated the power of the people in their willingness to get involved and find an alternative to a proposal that was not in the best interest of Nevadans and I applaud their endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] for their cooperation in moving this bill. H.R. 5277 is non-controversial and is supported by the entire Nevada delegation and I hope this body acts favorably so that we may pass it to the other body and they will have the opportunity to act before the end of this congressional session.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5277

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Forests of Nevada Enhancement Act of 1986".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the public lands transferred by this Act contain valuable natural resources (such as watershed, range, outdoor recreation and wildlife habitat) which will be enhanced by the professional, multiple-use management of the United States Forest Service;

(2) the public which utilize these natural resources will be benefited by such management;

(3) the public lands transferred by this Act are adjacent to existing national forests and, in many cases, are part of the same watersheds and mountain ranges, placing the management of these lands under the administration of one agency, the Forest Service, will improve efficiency and be cost effective; and

(4) there is a consensus in Nevada as shown in public hearings held throughout the State that these lands should be added to the national forests.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to transfer to the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, certain public lands in Nevada currently administered by the Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of the Interior. These public lands are contiguous to the Toiyabe, Humboldt, and Inyo National Forests and will become National Forest System lands.

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF PUBLIC LANDS TO THE FOREST SERVICE.

(a) TRANSFER.—(1) The public lands designated for inclusion in the National Forest System on a map entitled " ", dated " ", and numbered " " are

hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture and shall become part of the Toiyabe National Forest, the Humboldt National Forest, or the Inyo National Forest (as the case may be). Such lands shall be administered in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the national forests.

(2) The lands referred to in paragraph (1) include the following lands administered by the Secretary of the Interior:

(A) Lands in the Spring Mountains adjacent to Mount Charleston.

(B) Lands in the eastern Sierras.

(C) Lands on the east of the Ruby Mountains.

(D) Lands adjacent to the Utah border and Mount Moriah.

(b) **BOUNDARIES OF TOIYABE, HUMBOLDT, AND INYO NATIONAL FORESTS.**—(1) The boundary of the Toiyabe National Forest, the Humboldt National Forest, and the Inyo National Forest is hereby modified to reflect the transfer of lands under subsection (a).

(2) For the purpose of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-9), the boundary of the Toiyabe National Forest, the Humboldt National Forest, and the Inyo National Forest, as modified by this subsection shall be treated as if it were the boundary of those National Forests as of January 1, 1965.

(c) **MAP.**—The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of Agriculture may make changes to the map to correct technical errors.

SEC. 4. WILDERNESS SUITABILITY.

(a) **BLM STUDY AREAS.**—Any area or portion thereof designated as a Bureau of Land Management Wilderness Study Area (Mount Stirling, NV-050-401; LaMadre Mountains, NV-050-412) on the map referred to in section 3(a)(1) which is made a part of the National Forest System by this Act and for which a wilderness suitability study is complete or underway on the date of enactment of this Act, shall be managed by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782) until Congress designates that area as wilderness or releases it from further wilderness consideration.

(b) **ROADLESS AREAS NOT RECOMMENDED AS WILDERNESS.**—Any roadless area or portion thereof which is made a part of the National Forest System by this Act and which has been considered but not recommended for designation as wilderness pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) shall be deemed to have been adequately considered for wilderness for the purposes of the initial land management plans hereafter required for such lands by section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604). The Secretary of Agriculture shall not be required to manage such area to preserve wilderness values or to review the wilderness option before the revision of such plans, but the Secretary shall review the wilderness option for such area when such plans are revised.

(b) **NO ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to add lands to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

SEC. 5. WATER RIGHTS.

(a) **PRIOR EXISTING WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to expand or diminish any water right of the United States under State or Federal law which the United States had, or may be determined to have had by purchase, reservation, or otherwise, before the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **NO FEDERAL RESERVED WATER RIGHTS BY REASON OF TRANSFER.**—The designation and withdrawal of newly established national forest lands by this Act shall not create

any reserved water rights in the United States by reason of this Act with respect to those lands.

(c) **RIGHT TO ACQUIRE AND DISPOSE OF WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this Act shall affect the right of the United States or any person to acquire or dispose of water or water rights under applicable law.

SEC. 6. MANAGEMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to change the law governing the management of subsurface mineral resources.

SEC. 7. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.

With respect to the lands transferred by section 3(a), any formal administrative appeal, adjudication, or review pending on the date of enactment of this Act shall be completed by the Secretary of the Interior, except that the Secretary of Agriculture may exercise final administrative review.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "public lands" means the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of the Interior, as defined in section 103(e) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701(e)); and

(2) the term "National Forest System" means the lands administered by the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, and has the same meaning as defined in section 11 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SEIBERLING

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SEIBERLING: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Forests and Public Lands of Nevada Enhancement Act of 1986".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) the public lands transferred by this Act contain valuable natural resources (such as watershed, range, outdoor recreation and wildlife habitat) which will be enhanced by the professional, multiple-use management of the United States Forest Service; and that certain national forest lands would be enhanced by the professional multiple-use management of the Bureau of Land Management;

(2) the publics which utilize these natural resources will be benefited by such adjustments in management;

(3) the public lands transferred by this Act to the Forest Service are adjacent to existing national forests and, in many cases, are part of the same watersheds and mountain ranges, and placing the management of these lands under the administration of one agency, the Forest Service, will improve efficiency and be cost effective; that similar efficiency and cost effectiveness will result from transfer of certain forest lands to the Bureau of Land Management and;

(4) there is a consensus in Nevada that these lands should be added to the national forests and that some national forest lands should be transferred to the Bureau of Land Management for management.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to transfer to the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, certain public lands in Nevada currently administered by the Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of the Interior. These public lands are contiguous to the Toiyabe and Inyo National Forests and will become National Forest System lands.

(2) to transfer to the Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of the Interior, certain lands in Nevada currently administered by the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture. These lands are contiguous to other public lands and will be managed as such.

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF LANDS.

(a) **TRANSFER OF PUBLIC LANDS TO THE FOREST SERVICE.**—Effective 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the approximately 531,000 acres of public lands designated for inclusion in the National Forest System on two maps entitled "Nevada Interchange-A-1" and "Nevada Interchange-B-1" and dated October, 1986, are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture and shall become part of the Toiyabe National Forest or the Inyo National Forest.

(b) **BOUNDARIES OF TOIYABE AND INYO NATIONAL FORESTS.**—

(1) The boundary of the Toiyabe National Forests and the Inyo National Forest is hereby modified to reflect the transfer of lands under subsection (a).

(2) For the purpose of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-9), the boundary of the Toiyabe National Forest and the Inyo National Forest, as modified by this subsection, shall be treated as if it were the boundary of those National Forests as of January 1, 1965.

(c) **TRANSFER OF FOREST SERVICE LANDS TO THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.**—Effective 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the approximately 23,000 acres of national forest lands identified for management by the Bureau of Land Management on a map entitled "Nevada Interchange-A-1" and dated October, 1986, are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) **MAPS.**—The maps referred to in subsection (a) and subsection (c) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior. The Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior may make changes to the maps to correct technical errors.

(e) Effective 180 days after enactment of this Act, lands transferred by subsection (a) of this section to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture shall be subject to the planning requirements of section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, and lands transferred by subsection (c) of this section to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be subject to the planning requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. All transferred lands shall continue to be managed in accordance with plans in effect on the date of enactment of this Act until considered in plans developed under applicable provisions of law. If no plans are in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, the respective transferred lands shall be managed in a manner consistent with other national forest or public lands, as the case may be, in the vicinity until a plan is developed under applicable provisions of law. Nothing in this Act shall of

itself require the amendment or revision of the existing plans governing public lands or national forest affected by the addition of or deletion of lands transferred by this Act.

SEC. 4. WILDERNESS SUITABILITY.

(a) **BLM STUDY AREAS.**—Any area or portion thereof designated as a Bureau of Land Management Wilderness Study Area (Mount Stirling, NV-050-401; LaMadre Mountains, NV-050-412) on the map referred to in section 3(a) which is made a part of the National Forest System by this Act shall be managed by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782) until Congress designates that area as wilderness or releases it from further wilderness consideration.

(b) **ROADLESS AREAS NOT RECOMMENDED AS WILDERNESS.**—Any roadless area or portion thereof which is made a part of the National Forest System by this Act and which has been considered but not recommended for designation as wilderness pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) shall be deemed to have been adequately considered for wilderness for the purposes of the initial land management plans hereafter required for such lands by section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604). The Secretary of Agriculture shall not be required to manage such area to preserve wilderness values or to review the wilderness option before the revision of such plans, but the Secretary shall review the wilderness option for such area when such plans are revised.

(c) Any roadless areas on national forest lands, or portions thereof, recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture for wilderness which will be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 3(c) of this Act, shall be managed by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of section 603(c) of FLPMA, or other specific statutory direction.

(d) **NO ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to add lands to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

SEC. 5. MANAGEMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to change the law governing the management of mineral resources.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.

With respect to the lands transferred by section 3 any formal administrative appeal, adjudication, or review pending on the date of transfer of jurisdiction under this Act shall be completed by the Secretary of the Department in which it was initiated except that the Secretary of the Department having jurisdiction over the land pursuant to this Act may exercise final administrative review.

SEC. 7. VALID EXISTING RIGHTS.

(a) Nothing in this Act shall affect valid existing rights of any person under any authority of law as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Authorizations to use lands transferred by this Act which were issued prior to the date of transfer shall remain subject to the laws and regulations under which they were issued: Provided, that such laws and regulations will be exercised by the Secretary to whom jurisdiction over affected lands has been transferred by this Act. How-

ever, renewals and extensions shall be subject to the laws and regulations pertaining to the agency which has jurisdiction over the land at the time of renewal or extension. The change of administrative jurisdiction resulting from the enactment of this Act shall not in itself constitute a basis for denying the renewal or reissuance of any such authorization.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "public lands" means the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of the Interior, as defined in section 103(3) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701(e)); and

(2) the term "National Forest lands" or "National Forest System lands" means the lands administered by the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, and has the same meaning as defined in section 11 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

SEC. 9. ADMINISTRATION OF RECEIPTS.

The acreage added to the Toiyabe and Inyo National Forests in the State of Nevada by this Act shall not be counted in determining the distribution of the Twenty-Five Percent Fund between the States of California and Nevada under the Act of May 23, 1908, as amended. Provided, however, that the acreage added to these forests shall be counted in the distribution of the Twenty-five Percent Fund between the affected counties in Nevada.

Mr. SEIBERLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FOREST SKI AREA PERMIT ACT OF 1986

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from

the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2266) to establish a ski area permit system on national forest lands, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what is involved here?

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRANG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, this bill would modernize the system by which the Government leases national forest lands for ski areas. The House passed a virtually identical bill (H.R. 4489) last July, on suspension of the rules.

That bill was introduced by our colleague TIM WIRTH of Colorado and co-sponsored and supported by many Members on both sides of the aisle.

The only change from the text of the bill as it passed the House is the insertion of a sentence clarifying that, as existing law already requires, the Government should charge fair market value for these permits. This is a change in which I and the many co-sponsors of the bill concur, and I urge the Members to consent to the passage of the bill.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRANG. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I want to thank him for his great help in the passage of this legislation.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] have helped to move this legislation through the House with what I believe to be record time from the point of introduction to the point of passage today. This passage and the cooperation on the bill results from working on both sides of the aisle and working with the other body, who as the chairman of the subcommittee pointed out, was concerned about some issues relating to fair market value, which have also been very carefully worked out.

The thrust of this legislation, if the gentleman will yield further, will help us to provide greater economic stability for not only the ski industry, but the western slope of the State of Colorado, represented in large part by the gentleman from Colorado who had so kindly yielded.

The recreation job base is enormously important to our State. It is approximately a \$4 billion job base and the stability provided to this major in-

dustury through the passage of S. 2266 will be very, very helpful.

Finally, in working through the legislation we have worked with sportsmen's groups and with wildlife groups taking care of the concerns that they have, some justifiable concerns that were worked out through the subcommittee action, again with special reference and thanks to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG].

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

I would like to point out to the Members of this body that this bill is critical to American skiing and particularly to skiing, in my district, which has 30 areas, 17 percent of all the skiing in the United States.

I congratulate the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH] for his hard work and I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his diligent attention to this bill.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRANG. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, as a skier myself, I have a special incentive to promote this bill.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

An act to establish a ski area permit system on national forest lands, and for other purposes.

S. 2266

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(a) provide a unified and modern permitting process for nordic and alpine ski areas on national forest lands;

(b) provide for ski area permits which more closely reflect the acreage and other physical requirements of modern ski area developing; and

(c) provide a permit system which will be more commensurate with the long-term construction, financing, and operation needs of ski areas on national forest lands.

SEC. 3. SKI AREA PERMITS.

(a) **LAW APPLICABLE TO PERMITS.**—The provisions of the Act of March 4, 1915 (16 U.S.C. 497) notwithstanding, the term and acreage of permits for the operation of nordic and alpine ski areas and facilities on National Forest System lands shall henceforth be governed by this Act and other applicable law.

(b) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary"), is authorized to issue permits (hereinafter referred to as "ski area permits") for the use and occupancy of suitable lands within the National Forest System for nordic and alpine skiing operations and purposes. A ski area permit—

(1) may be issued for a term not to exceed 40 years;

(2) shall ordinarily be issued for a term of 40 years (unless the Secretary determines that the facilities or operations are of a scale or nature as are not likely to require long-term financing or operation), or that there are public policy reasons specific to a particular permit for a shorter term;

(3) shall encompass such acreage as the Secretary determines sufficient and appropriate to accommodate the permittee's needs for ski operations and appropriate ancillary facilities;

(4) may be renewed at the discretion of the Secretary;

(5) may be cancelled by the Secretary in whole or in part for any violation of the permit terms or conditions, for nonpayment of permit fees, or upon the determination by the Secretary in his planning for the uses of the national forests that the permitted area is needed for higher public purposes;

(6) may be modified from time to time by the Secretary to accommodate changes in plans or operations in accordance with the provisions of applicable law;

(7) shall be subject to such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate; and

(8) shall be subject to a permit fee based on fair market value in accordance with applicable law.

(c) **RULES AND REGULATIONS.**—Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate rules and regulations to implement the provisions of this Act, and shall, to the extent practicable and with the consent of existing permit holders, convert all existing ski area permits or leases on National Forest System lands into ski area permits which conform to the provisions of this Act within 3 years of the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to amend, modify or otherwise affect the Secretary's duties under the National Environmental Policy Act, or the Forest and Rangelands Renewable Resources Planning Act as amended by the National Forest Management Act, including his duties to involve the public in his decisionmaking and planning for the national forests.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CONVEYING CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE TOWN OF PAYSON, AZ

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 565) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey, without consideration, to the town of Payson, AZ, approximately 30.96 acres of Forest Service lands, with a Senate amendment to the House amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 11 of the House engrossed amendment, insert:

SEC. 5. Section 205 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1715(c)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (c) by striking out "Lands and interests" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in subsection (e), lands and interests"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Lands acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this section or section 206 in exchange for lands which were revested in the United States pursuant to the provisions of the Act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218) or reconveyed to the United States pursuant to the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1179), shall be considered for all purposes to have the same status as, and shall be administered in accordance with the same provisions of law applicable to, the revested or reconveyed lands exchanged for the lands acquired by the Secretary."

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior, if he determines it necessary and appropriate for the purpose of consummating an exchange of lands or interests therein under applicable law, is hereby authorized and directed to revoke the withdrawal under the First Form by Order of the Secretary of the Interior dated December 14, 1904, and as interpreted by Order of Interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior dated May 19, 1964, insofar as said withdrawal applies to Section 31 (Lots 1, 2, 3, W $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$) T. 5 N., R. 7 E., Gila and Salt River Meridian, Arizona.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any provision of law or order based thereon, the Secretary of the Interior, at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, is authorized to take such actions (including but not limited to the revocation of withdrawals and the issuance of patents) as may be necessary to facilitate and consummate a land exchange in Idaho known as the Mesa Falls Exchange, as described in a Land Exchange Notice by the Department of Agriculture published in the Post-Register newspaper published in Idaho Falls, Idaho on November 12, 1985 (p. B-5), if the Secretary of Agriculture decides to proceed with such exchange.

Mr. SEIBERLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment to the House amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. STRANG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I will not object, will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING], my chairman, please explain what is involved.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRANG. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, S. 565 deals with the transfer of certain lands in Arizona to the State, a county, and a town. The House passed the bill after making some amendments. The Senate has now returned the bill with amendments. The Senate amendments have all been passed by the House already as parts of other measures, and are noncontroversial provisions dealing with land management authorities of the Department of the Interior.

I believe we should go ahead and concur in the Senate amendments and clear the bill for the President.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the matter just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RELEASING CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS IN CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE TOWN OF JEROME, AZ

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1593) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release on behalf of the United States certain restrictions in a previous conveyance of land to the town of Jerome, AZ, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page, 2, line 3, strike out "4978894" and insert "497894".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. STRANG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio please explain what is involved?

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRANG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been returned with a technical amendment that corrects a typographical error. The bill is purely a housekeeping bill. I urge concurrence in the Senate amendment so the bill can be cleared for the President.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the matter just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

□ 1230

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL PARK

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2320) to amend an act to add certain lands on the Island of Hawaii to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I rise in support of S. 2320, to add approximately 5,600 acres to the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park through donation or exchange. The land parcel, known as tract 22, is adjacent to the park and has been identified for acquisition by the National Park Service for several years. It is presently a wilderness rain forest which provides prime habitat for several species of rare native birds.

The Park Service has been unable to acquire tract 22 due to a 1938 law which allows acquisition of land parcels adjacent to the park by donation only. When the landowner recently proposed geothermal activities on tract 22, the State of Hawaii acquired the tract through a land exchange. S. 2320 allows the Secretary to acquire tract 22 through an exchange by conveying to the State an approximately equal amount of Federal land in Hawaii that is considered surplus by the General Services Administration.

Mr. Speaker, tract 22 certainly qualifies as an appropriate addition to the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park due to its outstanding natural features. By exchanging this land parcel for surplus Federal land, only minimal Federal funds will need to be expended to complete the acquisition. This is particularly important due to the limited Federal appropriations available for land acquisition. During this difficult time of fiscal constraints, it is critical that we consider other methods to acquire important additions to our National Park System, such as the land exchange proposed in S. 2320.

The Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation held a hearing in June on a House companion bill to S. 2320. The testimony at the hearing reflected substantial public support for the measure. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee favorably reported S. 2320 on October 7.

For these reasons, I urge all of my colleagues to support S. 2320.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak today in support of S. 2320, a bill to amend an act to add certain lands on the island of Hawaii to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. The Senate passed this bill on September 10.

S. 2320 would allow the land exchange process to proceed so that eventually the 5,650 acres of tract 22 can become part of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. The James Campbell estate, previous owner of tract 22, desired to develop its energy resources. The State of Hawaii has already exchanged this land for other State lands to ensure that the resources of tract 22 are protected, while giving the James Campbell estate other land some 10 miles distant. Tract 22, on the park's north boundary, has long been the park's highest land acquisition priority. This tract of virgin ohia and fern rain forest also provides habitat for several endangered species. Without this legislation we risk geothermal development immediately adjacent to the park.

The proposed three-way land exchange, already entered into in good faith by the State of Hawaii and the James Campbell estate, provides us an example of a creative if complicated means of ensuring that precious resources are well protected even as private and State landowners are the 1938 legislation that established the park to allow for land exchange as well as donation.

I have recently received a letter from the State of Hawaii telling me that the State board of land and natural resources terminated and voided the Kahauale's a geothermal resource subzone, in the Kilauea upper east rift zone and the Kahauale's Conservation District use permit, an action confirmed by the Third Circuit Court for the State of Hawaii when it dismissed six appeals related to this land. The result is that no geothermal development may take place on tract 22 or the surrounding land, thereby protecting tract 22's subsurface rights.

By passing this legislation, we allow this exchange process to proceed in a manner to protect the resources in tract 22. The acquisition of tract 22 will also have the effect of providing greater protection for the rest of the park, and by ensuring that energy development will take place far from this magnificent place that is part of our heritage, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

I note that the entire Hawaii delegation wants this legislation, and that the National Park Service has long sought it. I want to thank DANNY AKAKA for his leadership and concern for the protection of park resources. He and his staff worked diligently on this legislation—the park will benefit from his efforts. I also want to thank JACK BROOKS and his staff for their close scrutiny of this bill and for their assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 2320.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2320, a bill which will enable Hawaii Volcanoes National Park to acquire a 5,650-acre tract adjacent to its present boundaries.

The parcel of land, which is presently unused, has been the National Park Service's acquisition priority in the Pacific area since 1951. This tree-fern rain forest, populated with native ohia, contains the habitat of the endangered Hawaiian Hawk and Hawaiian Ou as well as several other species found only in the Hawaiian archipelago. Congress identified the parcel as suitable for potential wilderness in 1978. Except for its non-Federal status, the tract possesses all the necessary attributes for wilderness designation.

Over the past 5 years, this important tract of land has been the focus of geothermal activities. In early 1982, its owner revealed plans for large-scale geothermal development on the land. Approximately 50 geothermal wells were proposed as close as 1,000 feet from the park boundary. Four proposed powerplants were to be located within 4,000 feet of

the park. While the State of Hawaii recognizes the need to develop alternatives to non-renewable energy resources and has emphasized this need through State legislation, we also recognize the importance of maintaining the integrity of Hawaii's largest national park. The adverse effects of geothermal emissions, surface disturbance, noise, odor, and vista impairment in close proximity to the park would have serious consequences. Such development would cause the deterioration of native plant and animal communities, fragmentation of the ohia fern forest essential for endangered native bird survival, degradation of the wilderness quality of the east rift and Kalapana extension areas, and destruction of present and future visitors' perceptions of the park.

After 2 years of searching for a means to satisfy these competing interests, a solution has been found that will allow geothermal development while removing its adverse effects from the immediate vicinity of the park. In December 1984, on the recommendation of the State board of land and natural resources, the owner of this tract was encouraged to consider a land exchange with the State of Hawaii. At the same time, the State encouraged the National Park Service to find a way of acquiring the tract for inclusion into Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. The State of Hawaii then began to consider the possibility of a three-party land exchange with the Federal Government that would allow the National Park Service to acquire this important parcel contingent upon the State and the landowner moving forward with their two-party exchange.

After several meetings among the State, the National Park Service, and the landowner, such an agreement was achieved. On April 18, the State of Hawaii and the landowner consummated their exchange, whereby tract 22 was acquired by the State in exchange for State land located farther downslope from the park. The State has indicated that it is willing to convey tract 22 to the Federal Government for park purposes in exchange for appropriate Federal land. However, Congress must enact legislation to allow the Department of the Interior to become a third party to this exchange agreement.

The benefits of this legislation are self-evident. First, the 5,650-acre tract of virgin rain forest would become part of the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, offering protection to endangered species and popular visitor attractions, allowing representation of this unique ecosystem in the National Park System, and facilitating National Park Service administrative control over the land for the purposes of public safety. Second, and equally important, geothermal development could proceed in an area well removed from the park. Furthermore, geothermal development could proceed immediately without the burden of continued hearings, protests, appeals, and threats of court actions which have held development to a standstill over the past 4 years. Third, there would be no need to seek major appropriations from Congress for the acquisition of the land at a time when budget considerations are on the minds of every Member of Congress. Finally, the more than 2½ million visitors that come to the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park from all parts of our Nation each year will

enjoy the benefit of an appropriate expansion of the State's natural treasures.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2320

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ADDITION TO HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL PARK.

The Act entitled "An Act to add certain lands on the island of Hawaii to the Hawaii National Park, and for other purposes" (52 Stat. 781; 16 U.S.C. 391b) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"Sec. 5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to acquire by donation, donation or exchange the land and interests therein comprising approximately 5,650 acres and identified as tract number 118/22 on the map entitled 'Recommended Land Acquisition', in the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park Land Protection Plan as recommended May 17, 1985, which plan shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. and the Office of the Superintendent, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Hawaii.

"(b) In exercising his authority to acquire the real property referred to in subsection (a) by exchange, the Secretary may accept title thereto and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such real property title to any United States Government real property under his administrative jurisdiction, other than real property within or administered as a part of the National Park System, in the State of Hawaii which he determines is suitable for such exchange. The values of the properties exchanged shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal, the values shall be equalized by the payment of money to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require. In no circumstance shall an equalization payment exceed one fourth (25 percent) the appraised value of the real property referred to in subsection (a). Any money paid to the Secretary shall be deposited as miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States.

"(c) Real property owned by the State of Hawaii or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation or exchange.

"(d)(1) In order to facilitate the acquisition of the real property referred to in subsection (a) by exchange, notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon request of the Secretary, the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary, without reimbursement, administrative jurisdiction over any excess or surplus United States Government real property in the State of Hawaii for purposes of such and exchange.

"(2) For the purposes of a land exchange with the State of Hawaii, the Secretary shall consult with the State of Hawaii in the process of identifying suitable exchange

lands belonging to the United States Government.

"(3) For the purposes of a land exchange with the State of Hawaii, real property owned by the United States Government and selected for use in a land exchange shall not be from among those lands ceded to the United States Government.

"(e) The real property acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be administered by the Secretary as part of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, subject to the laws and regulations applicable to the Park.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated up to \$700,000 to carry out the purpose of this section."

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3810—IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND LEGALIZATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1986

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAZZOLI

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 580, I move that the House insist on its amendments to the Senate bill, S. 1200, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LUNGREN

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is senior on the Judiciary Committee and is recognized.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LUNGREN moves that the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, S. 1200, be instructed to recede to the Senate from section 305 of the House bill entitled "Eligibility of Certain Agricultural workers for Legal Assistance" under which certain non-immigrant workers admitted or permitted to remain in the United States for agricultural labor or service are made eligible for legal assistance under the Legal Services Corporation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, in the immigration bill that we discussed at

length yesterday and finally passed, there was one area that was not subject to discussion, that was not allowed to be debated, but yet is one that I think is controversial, and as a matter of fact is extremely important.

The House has spoken on this matter before, and that is the question of the coverage of authority given to Legal Services. Legal Services Corporation, which is a corporation which is funded by the Federal Government, is one which allows services to be given to those who are unable to afford legal services on their own.

We have had debates on this floor about the extent of Legal Services. We have had debates on this floor as to the amount of funds that ought to be committed to Legal Services.

Suffice it to say that those who support Legal Services would suggest that we have not at this point in time funded it to the level that they believe in, because they suggest that they cannot perform all the legal services that are to be performed for the people intended.

On the other hand, there has been a very strong argument on this floor before that Legal Services Corporation ought to do that which we wish it to do, to provide legal services for those who cannot afford to have them themselves. We have in the past made a number of restrictions with respect to the ambit of authority given to the Legal Services operators.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] has in the past carried legislation on this floor which has passed which has said, among other things, that Legal Services Corporation attorneys should do the work for American citizens and American nationals and not for H-2 workers.

Why do we say that? H-2 workers are workers who are in a true sense guestworkers. They are brought in here after a certification has been made by the person seeking those workers that they are needed because domestic workers cannot be found; that in bringing them here they will not undercut the prevailing wage; that they cannot undercut the housing requirements that are made, if in fact that is a condition of employment; that they cannot undercut the work conditions.

And we have said on this floor in our votes before that that ought not be a group of people given taxpayers' attorneys that are otherwise supposed to help American citizens and nationals who are here that are unable to pay themselves.

As a result, that has not been allowed. Yet in this bill what we have said is for the very first time H-2 workers will have Legal Services representation.

When H-2 workers are in the United States, those workers are protected by their own country. They are allowed

to come here in agreement with the U.S. Government, and they are the people who are to protect them. They are represented by the representatives of their own Government, and there is no need at that point in time for Legal Services Corporation attorneys to be given that particular representation.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to clarify that the gentleman's motion to instruct applies to legal services for the H-2 workers in the bill, but not for legal services for the other agricultural workers.

Mr. LUNGREN. For those that are in section 305 of the House bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Is that all?

Mr. LUNGREN. Eligibility of certain agricultural workers for legal assistance. And it is my understanding that the debate that went on within the circles outside of the Congress and inside the Congress before we came to the floor went to the question of whether H-2 workers would be provided legal services assistance.

Mr. SCHUMER. Correct.

Mr. LUNGREN. That is the point to which this instruction goes. That is the intention of the author.

Mr. SCHUMER. So it is not the intention of the author to affect legal services for the so-called Schumer workers. Is that accurate?

Mr. LUNGREN. That is correct. It is directed at the H-2 workers.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LUNGREN. So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what we ought to do is remain consistent here in the House of Representatives. I recall that just a week ago a Member of Congress from the other side of the aisle representing an area of North Carolina came to the floor and talked to us about the problem that small farmers, very small farmers, were having with the local Legal Services Corporation attorneys who had managed to get around the restriction that we had placed in the law in a previous Congress. In fact, he recited to us some letters received by some of those small farmers in his district in which the letters basically said, "If you don't give us so much money in settlement we will keep you tied up in court."

He referred to that I believe as a type of legal blackmail. That is his assessment of it, and it seems to me under those circumstances that we ought to have our conferees instructed on that important question.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on the question asked a moment ago with respect to the Schumer amendments and the effect of the motion to instruct.

What about the category of those who may become eligible under the Schumer amendment but that in fact are not permanent residents for a period of time?

Mr. LUNGREN. It is my understanding that they would not be affected by this.

Mr. DAUB. So they would be able to get legal services even though they do not even have their green card, under certain circumstances?

Mr. LUNGREN. They would be able to get legal services at the time they received their green card. I will have to confess to the gentleman—

Mr. DAUB. At the time they get their green card.

Mr. LUNGREN. I will have to confess to the gentleman that I am uncertain of the point with respect to the temporary status period.

□ 1440

Mr. DAUB. So it would be my hope that we do not, by the colloquy we have just had for the record on your motion, which I support, remove from consideration in conference the refinement of the issue whether legal services ought to be available until that point that one becomes of legal status in this country.

Mr. LUNGREN. It is not my intention at this point in time to make any decision with respect to this body on that question. This goes to a specific area of the H-2 agreements that were reached, a dispute that was raised as to whether some people signed off on it or did not sign off on it. I was certainly not a party to that. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] whose amendment has been adopted into law in previous Congresses was not a party to any such agreement, and we think that since that has been presented on the floor, and the Congress has made a decision on that, that we ought to indicate to the conferees that we hope that they will remain consistent with respect to the decision made by this House in a previous year.

Mr. DAUB. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think that the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] makes a very good point, I must say to my colleagues, and that is that we ought not to confuse even the limited funding now some argue is given to Legal Services with a new sort of category, and dilute those funds, and be unable to manage the system under current circumstances, and as to the question of whether or not those who have not yet achieved permanent residence under any portion of the bill we are sending to conference would get the services of Legal Aid. That, as I understand it from the gentleman, re-

mains an open question for conference.

Mr. LUNGREN. That is my understanding.

Mr. DAUB. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, for purposes of debate only.

Mr. MAZZOLI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me just shift focus for just a moment away from H-2, whether it is for legal services for H-2 workers or legal services for temporary workers to permanent residents, and let me shift to the task before the Congress.

We hope we might get started on a conference perhaps later on this week or sometime next week and maybe report back to the House the completed bill on the very vexing and nettlesome topic of immigration reform. I would just hope that the body would not bind the hands of the conference members, the conferees, despite their feeling on legal services and whether it should be extended to H-2 workers or not.

The question is the conference committee has a very difficult task ahead of it, and if it goes into conference with one or two hands tied behind its collective back, then of course the opportunity of getting an agreement, which we are all looking for, in the short time left in the 99th Congress becomes all the more clouded. I would just implore the men and women of the House just to understand your conferees go into that conference aware of the House position on issues, both by way of votes and by way of informal agreements and conference calls and conversations. We are not unaware of the problems that some Members have with legal services. Let us have the opportunity, the freedom, to go into the conference and make some agreements. You always have an opportunity to vote up or down on what we eventually conclude.

So rather than tie us going in, let us have the freedom to make our agreements, in your name, and then report to you a completed product. At that time then you will have an opportunity to have a referendum on whether we have done our job correctly or incorrectly.

So with the greatest respect to my friend from California, with whom I have worked in harness and in tandem for a long time in seeking an immigration bill, let us just urge the House not to agree to this instruction. Let us go in uninstructed, unimpeded, free to make the decisions we have to make and report a bill back to you in due course.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and if I thought we were going into conference completely unimpeded with total free-

dom and flexibility to deal with this issue, I would not bring it up. But I fear that may not be the case, and that is a deep concern that I have. To be told at some point in time that some people understood a certain thing was to be the case, and then to suggest to those of us who have been involved in this issue before, who have prevailed on this issue before on the floor and all the way to legislation that somehow we may be heard, but we may not be effective, and may have no influence is something very difficult for us to accept.

The House has not had an opportunity to speak on this issue in the context of the bill. Some of us thought it should. We were unsuccessful in that, and to be told now that we ought to give conferees a full freedom, which is what I would like; which is what I would like, if I could have it stipulated on the record that there is going to be full freedom on this issue, then I will be happy to withdraw my request, but I doubt we could get that commitment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California, for purposes of debate only.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I was going to ask the gentleman from California a question.

There were several other provisions of the legislation that we adopted last night that were not subject to an amendment under the rule under which we considered the bill. Is the gentleman's motion to instruct directed to any of those, or has he picked out one particular issue that he is focusing on here and is just going to leave it at that, to achieve that particular purpose?

Mr. LUNGREN. I knew if the gentleman sat here long enough and heard the reading of the instruction he would understand exactly what I was doing, and the gentleman has very correctly described what I am doing. Yes, I have picked one of those out.

Does the gentleman wish to speak further?

Mr. BERMAN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, yes.

Mr. LUNGREN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California, for purposes of debate only.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do not consider this motion worth too much, although the gentleman who made it has a great deal of respect, in my opinion, and deserves it for the work he has done on this whole legislative effort.

But the motion seeks to undo one part of an elaborate negotiation that took place over many days last spring with respect to our current law on H-2. This is a program where the U.S.

Government sanctions bringing in foreign guest workers to harvest crops in certain parts of this country, particularly at this time in the Eastern United States, but in a program that has been utilized more and more in other parts of the country as well. Under that agreement a number of changes were made in the law, including changes sought passionately and through the immigration bill in both the other body and in the House version as introduced not only in this year but in the last session of Congress as well, changes to streamline the program, changes to bring in the Secretary of Agriculture, changes to alter different aspects of the protections now contained in regulations to protect those workers.

Part and parcel of that agreement was an understanding that the H-2 workers would be entitled if they otherwise qualified, and only if they otherwise qualified, to legal services representation, because without that, the protections contained for those workers, the housing protections, the domestic, the transportation of protections, the piecework rate and adverse impact wage rates protections become utterly meaningless. The fact is the history of the abuses in that H-2 program, which has been documented time and time again, cannot be corrected without effective representation, as you could easily contemplate guest workers coming here for a short period of time, hoping to come back again, anxious to pick up a wage considerably higher than the wage they might be making in their own country, have no individual ability and no effective collective ability to enforce the protections that the U.S. law is supposed to guarantee them. So from that point of view, with all of the different tradeoffs made in this compromise, legal services were agreed to, and soon after the passage of that bill from the Judiciary Committee the H-2 growers' representatives went back to some of their coalition members and apparently got some heat for making this commitment and now have turned everything on its head, tried to argue this is no longer a part of the agreement, and in a quite unscrupulous fashion this group of people is now urging people who are not party to the negotiations, and I want to make it very clear the gentleman from California was not party to that negotiation, there is nothing involved in the conversations that I have had with him that would in any way bind him to the position of this bill, but that group, in what I consider to be unscrupulous fashion, is now seeking to undo a position that they agree to in detailed negotiations and for which they got numerous changes in existing law; changes they have been seeking for years and years.

□ 1250

I again remind everyone that this is a nonbinding instruction, but urge that if you consider the merits of the very specific proposal, that the instruction be defeated.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I was called back to my district last night unavoidably, and I missed the last several votes, including final passage of the immigration bill.

I just want to say that in my district, which stretches from West Point almost to Lake Placid along the Hudson River, we have many ethnic groups, Italian, Irish and many others, who have waited patiently all their lives for their families to come over and I for one oppose any kind of amendments and any kind of legislation that would in any way give amnesty to or legalize illegal aliens in this country.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on final passage of the bill.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DAUB].

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize what we are about to do here. If you vote for the gentleman's motion to instruct, you are saying that in conference we want to insist on not allowing legal aid, tax-paid legal services, for H-2 guest-workers.

No other country takes care of our guest-workers' legal expense from their treasury, and it does not seem to me appropriate that we take care of guest-workers' legal expenses when they are here. So I hope that Members of Congress will support the gentleman's motion.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct. I rise on two grounds. One is that as the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] has said, that this conference is going to be a difficult conference. There are lots of issues outstanding; many different balances, and as we all know with immigration: "It ain't over 'til it's over; and it ain't over yet."

So we do have lots of problems, and anything that does tie the hands of the conferees, although it is perfectly legitimate for the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] to bring up this resolution; but anything that ties the conferees' hands just drops things, in my opinion, a notch in terms of the chances of getting a bill.

I was impressed last night—I think one could not fail to get impressed—with the overwhelming desire of this House to pass real and true and humane immigration reform.

The second point that I would make is substantive. Legal services—we dispute many different issues, and no one side has a higher moral ground than the other on any of them, in my opinion; people have different views.

The issue of legal services really means something very dear and near, at least to me. That is that you can give people all the rights you want, but if they have no way to enforce those rights, those rights are meaningless.

So we can write into the law that you must do this and must do that; but we all know that the INS is terribly overburdened; we all know that the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor are overburdened; they have been subject to cuts recently.

If you do not have some kind of way for the migrant laborer to enforce the law, then they are useless.

So what I would say to the good gentleman and gentlewomen in this Chamber is, if we are not going to have legal services, why kid ourselves? Why not just abolish all the laws that are supposed to protect these folk; because if you do not have legal services, the laws are unenforceable and useless.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I might just say, though, that these other countries, from whence these people come, represent these folks. They get the representation of their own government. They can make complaints to their own government; their own government can represent them, can pay for the attorneys involved.

That is the way it has been in the past; that is the way we would assume it would continue in the future. We have made sure, in the H-2 changes that we have made, that it is a better working program from both the standpoint of the worker and the employer.

So since we have put in statute more precise language, which used to be subject merely to regulation, if they have a complaint it is easier for their government to represent them with respect to those specific complaints.

I again ask the question of this House: Do you think that we have an abundance of legal services available to the poor people of America? If you do, and you think we have extra time for them to work and extra money for them to use, representing people because they are not representing enough now, then I guess you would vote down my motion to instruct.

Since they have this time they might as well do it for people who are

not citizens of this country who are here as guest-workers, who are here as a result of contractual agreements our country has with their country.

Evidently we believe that their countries do not have the resources to defend their own people; and we must use taxpayers' dollars to do that.

Mr. SPEAKER, I think that Members should be able to vote on that.

The other thing I would say is, I keep hearing "Don't tie us up in conference." I believe that. If the gentleman from New York will take the microphone at this time and tell me that we are not tied up on this issue going into conference, and that he will make sure that we visit it anew in conference, and that it is not predestined where we are going in conference, I will be happy to say this motion to instruct is frivolous.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I yield to the gentleman from California. I asked the gentleman from New York, but I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman indicating that if he is assured that in conference this is not an issue in the sense of the issues we discussed I guess it was the day before yesterday on the Schumer proposal, where Senators and Congressmen got together and said, "We agree on a package," and that makes that issue now predetermined. If the gentleman is asking, "Is this issue not in that category?" he would indicate that his own motion is frivolous and withdraw it?

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Since he has brought up that conversation we had, I guess I feel free to mention that conversation and others we have had in which you said we are free to consider it as long as you were assured that you have enough votes in the conference to prevail.

Now, that is not what I refer to as freedom. I understand freedom as meaning, "We will actually go in there and we will work on it." When I am told that I am allowed to have something brought up, as long as I am assured I am going to lose by the positions taken by the people on the conference, that bothers me a little bit; and I think the gentleman can understand, being as concerned about minority rights as I know he is in general, I know he would be concerned about minority rights in particular in this House.

Since I find myself in the minority party and I recognize being in conference, it is not apt to be selected to make sure that my position prevails. I just want to make sure it is not selected that my position has to absolutely lose when my position is the position

this House has carried in a full and open date and free vote.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that there is a set of issues that as the gentleman from California knows, and it is not a secret any more, that every person at least in the room that we negotiated in said, "We agree this issue is settled."

I do not believe, it is not my recollection of the meeting and I am sure it is not either gentleman from California's, that legal services for H-2 is among them. That if someone were to bring it up we would say, "Hey, we've decided that. We're not going back over old ground."

By the same token, it is perfectly within the gentleman from California's right to go to those who appoint the conferees and look and see what kinds of conferees and what their views are on certain issues, and I assure the gentleman, even though I am not privy to the discussions that, knowing how this place operates, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the chairman of the committee, Mr. RODINO, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. METZENBAUM, are all choosing conferees, looking at how the votes were going to come out. It would be sort of foolhardy to choose conferees who would not uphold the positions of the Houses or who would not be flexible enough to come to an agreement.

Mr. LUNGREN. I appreciate that. All I am trying to do is find out what the will of the House is so that we can be better informed; some would say instructed; I guess I would like to have a motion to inform conferees how the Members of the House feel on this, because I suspect when we are in conference, I will be reminded that motions to instruct are not binding.

Recognizing they are not binding, I wonder why Members on that side would not allow us to have the Members vote. It is a very, very simple question: Do you believe the foreign workers who are here under a contractual agreement between the United States and their country, ought to get taxpayers attorneys so they can pursue lawsuits against American citizen employers.

□ 1300

That is really the question here. They do have the ability at the present time to be represented by their own government or by legal representation hired by their own government. That is true now; it will continue to be true with one major exception. We have better defined the obligations and protections for the work-

ers here and they have a better opportunity now to represent them than they did before. For that I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think it is important if the gentleman is not going to find his own motion frivolous, that we get on the record a little bit of why that it is important that these H-2 workers have this representation. The first thing that is most important that the gentleman's statement overlooks is that the way that the current law is written with respect to legal services, it is not only Federal funds that cannot be used to represent H-2 workers, but legal services programs with private support and with private funds that seek to represent these workers cannot use those funds under the current law.

Mr. LUNGREN. If I may reclaim my time, so what the gentleman is saying is that under current law as passed by a previous Congress, legal services are not afforded H-2 workers.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. That is absolutely correct; there is no question about it.

Mr. LUNGREN. This would change present law.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. There is no question about it.

Mr. LUNGREN. Providing a benefit they do not receive now in taxpayer-supported attorneys.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. If the gentleman would yield further, I think the gentleman is handsly underscoring a point that needs underscoring. We would not be here discussing it nor would it be an important amendment to the bill if it were not a change of current law. It is a change of current law that has not always been the case. H-2 workers at an earlier time did receive representation and should receive representation.

I think the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] has been quite eloquent on the point that legal rights without legal representations are meaningless. The gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] has underscored the ability of foreign governments to advocate on behalf of H-2 workers for their rights. The problem with that, I think, can be seen analogously in our own context. People who are accused of discrimination or have problems with discrimination, workers in this country feel they are being discriminated against.

Both State and Federal Government in this country have government agencies specifically designated to look into those matters. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission on the Fed-

eral level. Yet no one here has thought that that was adequate in order to have those individual rights vindicated. We have provided for private right of action so that people can be represented and use our courts in order to enforce their rights. To say that some foreign government could do a better job with these foreign workers than can be done with our own enforcement agencies on behalf of our citizens really is not believable.

We have a serious problem of rights that are given U.S. law to these people who are here for the convenience of the U.S. economy. For those people to be denied a realistic way to enforce their rights, I think, is a great mistake.

And I emphasize that it is not only the use of Federal funds but private funds used by legal services programs that is forbidden under current law. It would seem to me all ought to want to make sure that these H-2 rules are obeyed and not violated, and to have legal services available is the best way to do that.

Mr. LUNGREN. I reclaim my time so that I may ask the gentleman a question: Do you believe legal services operations are funded to the extent necessary to take care of the poor people in America who are American citizens?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. The gentleman knows the answer to that question, and the answer is quite clear; of course they are not adequately funded.

Mr. LUNGREN. I appreciate the answer of the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Let me just continue to answer the question of the gentleman.

We have delegated at the Federal level the priority decisionmaking to local boards of directors and local bar associations. What we are doing in this change in the law, in the bill as we passed it last night, is to allow those boards of directors in setting priorities for their limited resources including privately raised funds and State funds as well as Federal funds, to choose, if they believe it is a priority, to choose to represent H-2 workers. That local determination will govern, not a national determination.

Mr. LUNGREN. OK. I will take back my time to suggest to my colleagues that yesterday we had a vote on the question of subsidized housing, taxpayer-paid housing. Most people recognize we do not have enough subsidized housing.

The question was, Should a preference be given to American citizens if you do not have all the housing that is necessary? This House said loud and clear, "Yes, you ought to give a preference." What we are saying here is that on taxpayer supported legal services we intend that to go to American citizens, not to foreign workers who are here on a contractual agreement be-

tween their country and the United States who have rights and they can have those rights presented in court by attorneys paid for by themselves or by their governments. And it should not be taxpayer-paid money to support attorneys to sue Americans by foreign workers who are here under a contractual agreement. That is the question. I think we have the opportunity to present it.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of the entire Senate bill and House amendment: Messrs. RODINO, KASTENMEIER, SEIBERLING, MAZZOLI, SYNAR, FRANK, SCHUMER, SMITH of Florida, BERMAN, BUCHER, BRYANT, FISH, MOORHEAD, LUNGREN, MCCOLLUM, SHAW, and DEWINE.

From the Committee on Agriculture, solely for consideration of sections 121-125, 202(h), 203, and 304 of the Senate bill and sections 116, 121, 204, 301-305, and 701 of the House amendment: Messrs. PANETTA, HUCKABY, and MORRISON of Washington.

From the Committee on Education and Labor, solely for consideration of section 101(d), 121-25, 202(h), 203, 304, 402, and 604 of the Senate bill and sections 101, 121, 201(h), 204, 301-305, 316(d), 402, 403, and 701 of the House amendment: Messrs. HAWKINS, FORD of Michigan, and JEFFORDS.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, solely for consideration of sections 125(b), 202(h), 203, 304 and 404 of the Senate bill and sections 121, 201(d), 201(h), 204, 404, and that portion of section 302(a) inserting subsection 210(f) in the Immigration and Nationality Act: Messrs. DINGELL, WAXMAN, and DANNEMEYER.

From the Committee on Ways and Means solely for the consideration of sections 121(a), 121(g), 121(h), 124(c), 125(b), 202(h), 203, 304, 404, and 602 of the Senate bill and sections 121, 201(h), 204, 302(b), 402, 404, 407, 601, 701, and that portion of 302(a) inserting subsection 210(f) in the Immigration and Nationality Act: Messrs. FORD of Tennessee, PEASE, and DAUB.

From the Committee on Rules, solely for the consideration of section 604(b) of the Senate bill and section 811 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BEILENSEN and Mr. TAYLOR.

As an additional conferee, solely for consideration of title VIII of the

House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. MOAKLEY.

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR AWARDED OF ELLIS ISLAND MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 381) expressing the support of the Congress for the awarding of the Ellis Island Medal of Honor as a symbol of the Statue of Liberty Centennial Celebration, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI] who is the chief sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 381.

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, Mr. GARCIA, and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York, Mr. GILMAN, for their expeditious treatment of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 381 expresses the support of Congress for the awarding of the Ellis Island Medal of Honor as a symbol of the Statue of Liberty Centennial Celebration scheduled for the weekend of October 27.

The Ellis Island Medal of Honor is designed to recognize and honor the contributions made to our Nation by all of our various heritage groups. Approximately 80 medals will be awarded on the night of October 27 in New York to individuals who have "lived a life dedicated to the American way while preserving the values and tenets of a particular heritage group."

The Ellis Island Medal of Honor is to be awarded by the Statue of Liberty Ellis Island Foundation as well as the New York Statue of Liberty Centennial Commission in cooperation with the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations. To that end I wish to pay a special tribute to Statue of Liberty Ellis Island Foundation President William May and William Fugazy, honorary chairman of NECO. These individuals worked long and hard to develop the

idea and reality of these medals which will be of such value to those fortunate enough to receive them.

It should be noted that these medals were in part necessitated by an unfortunate procedure which took place during the Fourth of July celebration at the Statue in New York. During those festivities, 12 Liberty Medals were awarded. The individuals selected, while all meritorious, represented only about 20 percent of our Nation's ethnic groups. This despite the intent of these medals to pay tribute to the contribution that ethnic Americans have made to our Nation over the past 100 years.

The Ellis Island Medal of Honor, we trust, will help serve to correct that omission and provide an equally appropriate honor to a more representative group of honorees.

It is critical to remember that we are a nation whose people have strong ties to many homelands. It is the contributions of America's heritage groups—all of them collectively, that has made this Nation strong. That is the intent behind the Ellis Island Medal of Honor—to pay tribute to all.

I urge my colleagues to support this request for passage of House Concurrent Resolution 381.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object under my reservation, I am pleased to rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 381, endorsing the awarding of the Ellis Island Medals of Honor. I want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI], for introducing this measure, and for his dedication and leadership in the fight for equal rights for the minority citizens in Northern Ireland. Mr. BIAGGI is renowned for his dedicated work as chairman of the Congressional Ad Hoc Committee on Irish Affairs, in focusing the attention of the Congress on the vital role our Nation can fulfill in facilitating a just and lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

On October 28, 1986, in honor of the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty's actual dedication, there will be an official rededication ceremony in New York. On that day, the Ellis Island Medal of Honor will be awarded to individuals who exemplify the ideal of living a life dedicated to the American way while preserving the values and tenets of their own heritage.

The Ellis Island Medal of Honor will be awarded to those individuals who have made special contributions to the reinforcement of the bonds between a heritage group and the people of its land of origin. These individuals will be further distinguished by their service to humanity in their chosen field, profession, or occupation.

As my colleagues may recall, earlier this summer, when the winners of the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Founda-

tion's Medals of Liberty were announced, the group of 12 did not include members of many of the country's largest ethnic groups. At the October 28, ceremony in New York, approximately 80 medals will be awarded, with at least one medal being awarded to a member of each heritage grouping that had a population of 200,000 or more in the 1980 census.

I would like to commend the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Foundation, the New York Statue of Liberty Centennial Commission, and the National Ethnic Coalition of the Organizations for their efforts in establishing the Ellis Island Medal of Honor.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution which endorses these very special awards.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 381

Whereas on October 28, 1986, in honor of the actual dedication of the Statue of Liberty, there will be an official rededication ceremony in New York;

Whereas on that occasion the Ellis Island Medal of Honor, to be awarded by the Statue of Liberty Ellis Island Foundation and the New York Statue of Liberty Centennial Commission in cooperation with the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations, will be presented to a group of distinguished American citizens;

Whereas the Ellis Island Medal of Honor will be awarded to individuals who exemplify the ideal of living a life dedicated to the American way while preserving the values and tenets of a particular heritage group;

Whereas the Medal will be awarded to individuals who have made special contributions to the reinforcement of the bonds between a heritage group and the people of its land of origin; and

Whereas the Medal will be awarded to individuals for distinguished service to humanity in any field, profession, or occupation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States endorses and supports the awarding of the Ellis Island Medal of Honor, on October 28, 1986, as an appropriate symbol of the Statue of Liberty Centennial Celebration.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL WORKER PROGRAM

(Mr. WEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order to engage

in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify the purpose of his Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program. As I understand the program, it is intended to benefit growers of perishable agricultural commodities. Section 302 of this bill defines "seasonal agricultural services" as "field work related to * * * fruits and vegetables of every kind and other perishable commodities."

As I interpret this definition, it would not include trees grown for lumber as a perishable commodity, nor would it cover forestry services such as tree planting, tree thinning, and related forestry labor. Is that interpretation correct?

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. The gentleman is correct. Forest practices and forestry labor are in no way covered by the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program or the definition of "seasonal agricultural services."

Mr. WEAVER. If the gentleman would yield further: As the gentleman knows, trees grown for lumber are not considered an agricultural commodity under longstanding interpretations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. While forestry labor is sometimes included in the definition of agriculture, this has been done only in broad remedial statutes like the Migrant and Seasonal Agriculture Worker Protection Act. The gentleman's program, as I understand it, is not remedial in nature and therefore including forestry labor or trees grown for lumber within its provisions would be inappropriate. Is that correct?

Mr. SCHUMER. The gentleman is correct. This program does not cover trees grown for lumber or forestry labor, nor is it intended to cover them.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman for clarifying the scope of his Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program.

□ 1315

NATIONAL WOMEN VETERANS RECOGNITION WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 311) designating the week beginning November 9, 1986, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 311

Whereas there are more than one million one hundred and eighty thousand women veterans in this country, representing 4.2 per centum of the total veteran population;

Whereas the number and proportion of women veterans will continue to grow as the number and proportion of women serving in the Armed Forces continue to increase;

Whereas women veterans through honorable military service often involving hardship and danger have contributed greatly to our national security;

Whereas the contributions and sacrifices of women veterans on behalf of this Nation deserve greater public recognition and appreciation;

Whereas the special needs of women veterans, especially in the area of health care, have often been overlooked or inadequately addressed by the Federal Government;

Whereas this lack of attention to the special needs of women veterans has discouraged or prevented women veterans from taking full advantage of the benefits and services to which they are entitled as veterans of the United States Armed Forces; and

Whereas recognition of women veterans by the Congress and the President through enactment of legislation declaring the week beginning on November 9, 1986, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week" would serve to create greater public awareness and recognition of the contributions of women veterans, to express the Nation's appreciation for their service, to inspire more responsive care and services for women veterans and to continue and reinforce important gains made in this regard in the last two years as a result of the designation of the first and second National Women Veterans Recognition Week in November of 1984 and 1985: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning on November 9, 1986, is designated "National Women Veterans Recognition Week". The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all citizens, community leaders, interested organizations, and Government officials to observe that week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDICIAL EFFICIENCY AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1985

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3578) to

provide permanent authority for hearing commissioners in the District of Columbia courts, to modify certain procedures of the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission and the District of Columbia Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments.

(For text of the Senate amendments, see page 28588 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 3, 1986.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so just to ask the gentleman if this piece of legislation has been cleared by the minority leader.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it has been cleared by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] who is in support of it, and the staff will so indicate.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, each piece of legislation coming out here right now is supposed to have clearance of the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], his personal clearance. Has this been personally cleared by Mr. MICHEL?

Mr. DYMALLY. I have been instructed that it has been cleared.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY] to explain H.R. 3578.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 3578, passed the House on October 28, 1985. It is the culmination of a great deal of scrutiny and give and take by the local courts, the city council, the bar association and of course, the respective committees of this Congress, which reported this legislation.

H.R. 3578, the District of Columbia Judicial Efficiency Act of 1985, improves the administrative operations of the local courts. It provides permanent authority for hearing commissioners in the District of Columbia Superior Court and establishes procedures for their selection and discipline. This change would bring the District law into compliance with the requirements of the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984 (Public Law 98-378).

It also reorganizes the court's audit responsibilities, authorizes the District of Columbia appellate court to consider certified questions of law from State courts of appeal about District of Columbia law, amends procedures for judicial nomination and tenure review and eliminates the chief judge

of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia as the presiding officer of the panel which selects the public defenders service board of trustees. It would make the chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals the presiding officer.

The Senate amendments make several changes. It deletes section 2 of H.R. 3578—which would have required the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia to make an annual report regarding prosecutions in the District. The Senate found this provision unnecessary since a statistical report was already being made on the same subject by that office.

Second, it requires the chief judge of the superior court and the board of judges to monitor the conduct and exercise discipline of hearing commissioners. It also requires the chief judge of the superior court to conduct a study of the revised hearing commissioner system and report its findings to the appropriate House and Senate committees within 1 year of this bill's enactment.

The Senate amendments would also limit a retired judge to a 1-year period after retirement in order to request to be appointed as a senior judge from the District of Columbia Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure.

The Senate bill would require retired judges serving as senior judges to be reviewed every 4 years regarding his or her suitability to continue in that capacity. Judges 74 and over would have to be reviewed every 2 years.

Currently retired judges are grandfathered for 180 days from the date of this enactment.

The Senate amendment guarantees that senior judges are compensated at the same daily rate as active judges. Thus, senior judges will be compensated at the same rate for the same amount of work.

I would add, the Senate amended its reported committee bill to remove the chief judge of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit from the panel which selects the board of trustees of the public defender services, and to designate the chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals as the presiding officer of that panel.

This is consistent with the House passed bill. While substantive, this change in no way diminishes the independence of the public defender service. This amendment is consistent with home rule in the District and as the Senate vote suggests, the chief judge of the local court of appeals is the more appropriate presiding judge of that panel. His or her dependence in that role is in no way compromised merely because he is chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals

as opposed to the U.S. Court of Appeals, for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the product of a great deal of legislative time, resources and scrutiny. Undoubtedly, it will greatly improve judicial efficiency in District of Columbia. I also take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Virginia, who contributed a great deal to this legislation. Thus, the recommendation on this side of the aisle is that we accept and concur in the Senate amendments. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH CENTENNIAL YEAR

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 395) to designate the period October 1, 1986, through September 30, 1987, as "National Institutes of Health Centennial Year," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 395

Whereas the National Institutes of Health over the past 100 years, has grown from a one-room laboratory of hygiene within the Stapleton Marine Hospital on Staten Island, New York, to become one of the largest and most respected biomedical research centers in the world;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health, as an agency of the Department of Health and Human Services, is the Nation's flagship in mankind's continuing battle to conquer disease;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health continuously contributes to the discovery of new knowledge that leads to longer lives and better health for all people;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health provides national leadership in a critical partnership of the Government, academic, and private sectors;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health conducts research in its own laboratories, supports the research of non-Federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and other public, private, and voluntary research institutions throughout this country and abroad;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health fosters training and career development of future research scientists, sponsors the enhancement of research resources, and promotes improvements in biomedical communications;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health facilitates the assembly of United States and foreign biomedical scientists and promotes the exchange of scientists and scientific information between the United States and other countries;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health supported the work of 60 Nobel Prize winners before their selection as laureates;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health has contributed to the great strides of the past 100 years in the control and virtual worldwide elimination of epidemic diseases such as cholera, smallpox, yellow fever, and bubonic plague, and the prevention in this country of childhood diseases such as diphtheria, polio, tetanus, and pertussis;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health has stimulated biomedical research that has played a role in the 70-percent reduction in the death rate in the United States since 1900;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health has pioneered new methods for the detection and treatment of diseases and has promoted their widespread dissemination into medical practice;

Whereas grantees and scientists of the National Institutes of Health work at the forefront of biomedical technologies that open up new opportunities in medical research;

Whereas the next 100 years will undoubtedly see the National Institutes of Health lead the world in ways of promoting health and preventing disease;

Whereas the Congress of the United States has consistently supported the National Institutes of Health to maintain America's preeminence in medical research; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States looks to the National Institutes of Health for progress in overcoming the diseases that afflict the people of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the period of October 1, 1986, through September 30, 1987, is designated as "National Institutes of Health Centennial Year", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such year with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read

the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 594) to designate the week beginning May 4, 1986, as "National Correctional Officers Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 594

Whereas American correctional officers who work in our jails and prisons are currently responsible for the containment and control of over six hundred thousand prisoners;

Whereas correctional officers must protect inmates from violence while encouraging them to develop skills and attitudes that can help them become productive members of society following their release;

Whereas the morale of correctional officers is affected by many factors, and the public perception of the role of correctional officers is more often based upon dramatization rather than factual review;

Whereas good job performance requires correctional officers to absorb the adverse attitudes present in confinement while maintaining themselves as professionals in order to have their actions appreciated and accepted by the public at large;

Whereas correctional officers had been similarly honored by many States and localities in 1984 and 1985;

Whereas correctional officers had been similarly honored by a joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled in 1984 and 1985; and

Whereas the attitude and morale of correctional officers is a matter worthy of serious congressional attention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the week beginning May 4, 1986 hereby is designated "National Correctional Officers Week" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Page 2, line 3, strike "May 4, 1986" and insert "May 3, 1987".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Amend the title to read as follows: "A joint resolution to designate the week beginning May 3, 1987 as 'National Correctional Officers Week'."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL PEARL HARBOR REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 322) to designate December 7, 1986, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day" on the occasion of the anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 524, designating December 7, 1986, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day" and I take this opportunity to thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND] for introducing this resolution which will allow Americans of all ages to honor and remember those who lost their lives in the Pearl Harbor massacre.

Early on the morning of Sunday, December 7, 1941, the Empire of Japan launched a brutal and unprovoked attack on the U.S. Navy, Army, Air Force, and Marine bases at Pearl Harbor, HI. Over 2,400 Americans were killed and 1,200 wounded on that fateful day—the day that President Roosevelt said "will live in infamy."

It was not until after World War II ended that the American people were fully apprised of what a severe, crippling blow the attack on Pearl Harbor inflicted on our defenses. The cream of our Navy and our Army in the Pacific were virtually wiped out in one devastating blow.

But what the Japanese Empire did not count on was the galvanizing effect that dastardly attack would have on the American people. Prior to December 7, the role of the United States in world affairs was the topic of intense debate. That debate ended as the bombs fell. All Americans became united in the effort for victory with a vigor and determination unknown in any American conflict, before or since.

The ultimate tragedy of Pearl Harbor was the fact that it could have been foreseen and prevented. Candidates for graduation at the Japanese military academies had been asked to plan an attack on Pearl Harbor as part of their final examinations each year since 1931. The Japanese secret code had been broken, and the State Department was aware that an attack was imminent. However, the location of the strike was not known, and so our commanders were not notified in a timely fashion.

This does not mean, however, that our 3,600 casualties were killed or wounded in vain. The heroism demonstrated that fateful Sunday morning did much to inspire millions of Americans on to greater sacrifice and heroism which was necessary for our ultimate victory.

Every 5 years, on December 7, the survivors of Pearl Harbor reunite at Pearl Harbor. This year will mark the 45th anniversary of Pearl Harbor and our thoughts will be with those survivors and their families, as well as the families who have lost sons and daughters in that conflict. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution designating December 7 as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day" and to encourage their communities to conduct appropriate observances.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this joint resolution, and thank all of my colleagues here for presenting it.

National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day, of course, has great meaning for us on the Island of Hawaii. It has particular meaning for me. Pearl Harbor is with the district which I represent.

I want to remind all here that service to our country came from Hawaii in World War II after Pearl Harbor, the most decorated unit in the entire U.S. Armed Forces, the 442d Regiment, of which our senior Senator, Mr.

INOUE, was a member and our other Senator, Mr. MATSUNAGA.

I am sure that many in this body know, and I hope that everyone in the country recognizes, that many from Hawaii gave their lives. Not only were they the most decorated, but in terms of the wounds that took place it was one of the most grievous combat regiments in the U.S. Armed Forces.

□ 1325

Hawaii, I think because of the service that was rendered to our country after Pearl Harbor, was in the forefront with respect to commanding the attention of the country once statehood was given to Hawaii in 1959. I think the people of our Nation remembered the service that had been performed by people in the then Territory of Hawaii as it became a State.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me today to rise and ask that we receive unanimous consent for National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdrew my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 322

Whereas on the morning of December 7, 1941, the Imperial Japanese Navy and Air Force launched an unprovoked surprise attack upon units of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed at Pearl Harbor, HI;

Whereas over two thousand four hundred citizens of the United States were killed in action and one thousand one hundred and seventy-eight were wounded in this attack;

Whereas President Franklin Delano Roosevelt referred to the date of the attack as "a date that will live in infamy";

Whereas the attack on Pearl Harbor marked the entry of this Nation into World War II;

Whereas the people of the United States owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to all members of our Armed Forces who served at Pearl Harbor, in the Pacific Theater of World War II, and in all other theaters of action of that war; and

Whereas the veterans of World War II and all other people of the United States will commemorate December 7, 1986, in remembrance of this tragic attack on Pearl Harbor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That December 7, 1986, the anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, is designated as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States—

(1) to observe this solemn occasion with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

(2) to pledge eternal vigilance and strong resolve to defend this Nation and its allies from all future aggression.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read

the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GAUCHER'S DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 352) to designate the week beginning September 7, 1986, as "Gaucher's Disease Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 615, I am pleased to support this bill to designate the week of October 19, 1986, as "National Gaucher's Disease Awareness Week." A companion bill, Senate Joint Resolution 352, passed the Senate on October 3, 1986.

Gaucher's disease is the most prevalent among seven genetic disorders known to primarily affect Jewish populations. As many as 1 in 12 Jewish persons may be a carrier of Gaucher's disease which means that an estimated 1 child in every 600 born could have the disease.

Gaucher's disease is caused by the body's failure to produce an essential enzyme. The absence of this enzyme causes the body to store abnormal quantities of lipids in the liver and spleen and can have an adverse effect on tissues in the body, especially bone tissue. Commonly associated symptoms include an enlarged spleen, unusual bruising or bleeding, and bone and joint pain.

There is no known cure for Gaucher's disease nor any successful treatment. The National Gaucher Foundation was established to promote and support Gaucher's research and increase public awareness regarding this disease.

I thank my colleagues for joining me in co-sponsoring this resolution and focusing much needed attention on understanding and finding a cure for this disease.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 352

Whereas Gaucher's disease is caused by the failure of the body to produce an essential enzyme;

Whereas the absence of such enzyme causes the body to store abnormal quanti-

ties of lipids in the liver and spleen and frequently has an adverse effect on tissues in the body, particularly bone tissue;

Whereas among Jewish persons, Gaucher's disease is the most common inherited disorder affecting the metabolism of lipids, which are one of the principle structural components of living cells;

Whereas there is no known cure for Gaucher's disease and no successful treatment of the symptoms of the disease;

Whereas the increased awareness and understanding of Gaucher's disease by the people of the United States can aid in the development of a treatment and cure for the disease;

Whereas the National Gaucher's Disease Foundation provides funds for research in the United States with respect to the disease; and

Whereas research and clinical programs with respect to Gaucher's disease should be increased: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning September 7, 1986, is designated "Gaucher's Disease Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHAYS' REBELLION WEEK AND SHAYS' REBELLION DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 10) to designate the week beginning January 19, 1987, as "Shays' Rebellion Week" and Sunday, January 25, 1987, as "Shays' Rebellion Day," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 10.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA], and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for bringing this resolution to the floor. I also wish to thank all of my colleagues here who signed this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of this legislation, it gives me great pleasure to see House Joint Resolution 10, which will designate the week of January 19, 1987, as "Shays' Rebellion Week" and Sunday, January 25, as "Shays' Rebellion Day," brought to the floor of the House for consideration.

This weekend, in Daniel Shays' hometown of Pelham, MA, I will be joining the people in honoring the bicentennial of the rebellion, and I think it is proper for Congress to join us and the many other people paying tribute to this important part of our Nation's heritage.

Shays' Rebellion was a farmers revolt against many of the injustices which were present in the young Nation under the Articles of Confederation. Taxes were high and many farmers were in debt. Sound money was scarce, and the courts were dealing out harsh penalties on the indebted farmers.

Daniel Shays and his men were not malcontents. Most of them had served America in the Revolutionary War, and Shays was even awarded a sword from Lafayette for his service.

One would have to imagine that Shays was extremely proud of this sword, but due to the economic problems of the time he was forced to sell it.

While Shays' Rebellion was put down by Federal forces, it had a profound effect on our Nation. Shays' Rebellion demonstrated both the injustices and weaknesses of the system under the Articles of Confederation, and helped pave the way for our beloved Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this legislation, and hope for its immediate approval.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 10

Whereas January 25, 1987, marks the bicentennial of the final uprising in western Massachusetts of Daniel Shays and his men, during a period of unrest in the years following the Revolutionary War;

Whereas the landowners of western Massachusetts felt they were unduly burdened because money was scarce, taxes were high, punishments for debts were severe, and the government was unresponsive;

Whereas Shays led the dissatisfied landowners in a series of attacks to stop debt procedures in local courts;

Whereas on January 25, 1787, a major confrontation occurred in Springfield when the militia wounded, killed, and caught several of Shays' rebels as they stormed the arsenal;

Whereas the uprisings of Shays' Rebellion exposed the problems in the existing form of government to the people of America and

prompted a meeting of delegates in Philadelphia to correct the weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation; and

Whereas Shays' Rebellion was instrumental in bringing about the writing of the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning January 19, 1987, is designated as "Shays' Rebellion Day". The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week and day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SOCIAL STUDIES WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 232) to designate October 6, 1986, through October 10, 1986, as "National Social Studies Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 410, legislation which I introduced last year that would designate the week of October 6 through 10, 1986, as "National Social Studies Week."

Two years ago, America suddenly seemed to discover that there were problems in our public schools, and that our children were graduating from high school poorly prepared for the job market in our changing economy. I strongly supported this renewed interest in our education system, and I lauded efforts to provide greater incentives for schoolteachers, to toughen up education standards, and to reintroduce some degree of moral guidance into the schools. Nothing is more precious to America than its next generation, and nothing we in Congress could do would be more important than to ensure that it receives an excellent education.

Since that time, we have begun to make progress toward the kind of education system that this country must have. The Federal Government, the States, and local school boards have all willingly entered the battle to improve our schools. However, our work has just begun—it's vital now that we not slacken our pace or reduce our efforts. There's no quick fix available, and there's no end to our effort, however. Consequently, we in Congress have to constantly remind ourselves and our con-

stituents of the importance of education and of the need for continued effort. One of the ways that we can do this is through the use of such commemorative legislation as House Joint Resolution 410 to focus the country's attention on the value of our schools. In today's fast-moving global economy Americans need to know not only the three R's—reading, writing, and arithmetic. They also have to know about the world they live and work in.

The postwar world is a much smaller, more interdependent one, in which America has a central role. It's important for Americans to know about other countries and their cultures, important because what goes on in those other countries affects American jobs, and important in a broader sense because democracy requires an informed, intelligent electorate.

The other body has already passed identical legislation introduced by Senator PAUL SIMON of Illinois. I urge my colleagues in the House to act today and pass this very worthwhile legislation.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 232

Whereas national attention should be focused on the exemplary efforts of social studies teachers in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 6, 1986, through October 10, 1986, is designated as "National Social Studies Week", and that the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADULT IMMUNIZATION AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 396) to designate the week of October 26, 1986, through November 1, 1986, as "National Adult Immunization Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 700 which designates the week of October 26, 1986, through November 1, 1986, as "National Adult Immunization Awareness Week."

Once again we are threatened with a serious flu and pneumonia epidemic. It strikes hardest among the elderly and chronically ill and may claim up to 40,000 American lives this year alone. Many of these elderly Americans will fall prey to these preventable diseases simply because they were unaware that an inoculation—a simple shot—could save their lives.

Pneumococcal pneumonia is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States. This microorganism attacks more than a half million Americans each year and is responsible for 25,000 to 30,000 deaths. And it is the Nation's elderly and chronically ill who are most at risk. For those over 60, the incidence of pneumonia increases significantly. For the fragile old—those over 75—the death rate is 10 times greater.

Influenza is another great threat to our Nation's elderly. Since the mid-1950's we have seen 16 influenza epidemics that have taken 10,000 or more American lives in each epidemic. Again this year, elderly Americans will be challenged by this bug. But they can be protected with a safe and effective vaccination.

House Joint Resolution 700 will officially recognize the ongoing national campaign designed to educate and motivate all Americans—especially the elderly—to protect themselves through immunization. This resolution designates the week of October 26, 1986, as "National Adult Immunization Awareness Week." A companion bill, sponsored by Senator ORRIN G. HATCH, has passed the Senate. The bipartisan support for this resolution is evidence of the recognition that it is time for national leadership to help eradicate these deadly and crippling infectious diseases by supporting the National Adult Immunization Awareness Week.

House Joint Resolution 700 will put Congress on record behind this campaign. It calls on the President to proclaim the week of October 26 for observance by all Americans of the need to inoculate against flu, pneumonia, and other diseases for which adults are at risk. Our goal is to motivate the elderly to take their shots before the start of the flu season. This awareness week can help prevent the loss of many precious American lives.

I am pleased to have been the original author of House Joint Resolution 700 on August 11, 1986, and to be able to report that we now have over 150 cosponsors of the resolution in the House of Representatives.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my support for House Joint Resolution 700. This resolution would designate the week of October 26, 1986 as "National Adult Immunization Awareness Week."

It is important that we publicize the need for Americans to be immunized against infectious diseases so as to aid in the control and eradication of such illnesses. Passage of this resolution would set the stage for a public cam-

paign to raise awareness of the necessity of immunizations.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the passage of House Joint Resolution 700 and give a boost to efforts to improve the health standards of this country.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 396

Whereas influenza and pneumonia are among the top killers of American adults, especially elderly Americans;

Whereas fewer than 12 percent of the adult population is adequately protected against these diseases or against other highly infectious diseases including measles, rubella, diphtheria, and hepatitis B;

Whereas less than half of Americans over 60 are inoculated against the deadly tetanus toxoid;

Whereas the lives of tens of thousands of American adults could be spared this year simply by taking vaccines that are approved as safe and effective by the United States Food and Drug Administration and are readily available to the public; and

Whereas the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service has repeatedly called on this Nation to prevent the massive costs of health care through a program of preventive health care, of which a major role is played by inoculation against infectious diseases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of October 26, 1986, through November 1, 1986, is designated as "National Adult Immunization Awareness Week". The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL KIDNEY PROGRAM DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 367) to designate September 24, 1986, as "National Kidney Program Day," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object; I would simply like to inform the House the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 367

Whereas, the tens of thousands of Americans suffering from irreversible kidney disease are treated by Medicare's End Stage Renal Disease (ESRD) Program;

Whereas, this program has assured that every American suffering from otherwise fatal kidney failure has access to lifesaving dialysis or transplantation therapy;

Whereas, ESRD beneficiaries may remain economically productive and are able to continue to make irreplaceable contributions to family, community and country;

Whereas, this extraordinarily successful program has a special significance as an example of the power of partnership between Government and the healthcare industry in dealing with catastrophic illness; and

Whereas, this partnership has achieved economy in health services without compromising quality of care or social responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to designate the day of September 24, 1986, as National Kidney Program Day and call upon the Federal, State, and local government agencies and the people of the United States to observe such day with the appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Page 2, line 4, strike "September 24, 1986," and insert "October 23, 1986."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to designate October 23, 1986, as 'National Kidney Program Day'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1335

NATIONAL BOWLING WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 620) designating the week beginning January 4, 1987, as "National Bowling Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 620

Whereas bowling is one of the oldest and most popular indoor family sports in the world and is played in more than 79 nations;

Whereas people have computed in some form of bowling for thousands of years;

Whereas many immigrants brought a form of bowling from their homeland during the birth of America;

Whereas bowling has contributed to the social fabric of the United States with 8,000,000 people participating as members of local bowling organizations in more than 2,800 cities and towns across our land;

Whereas bowling is played in 8,300 bowling centers, virtually in every community in the Nation; and has emerged as the longest running, most highly rated individual sport television series on Saturday;

Whereas bowling is the largest indoor participation sport in the United States with over 69,000,000 Americans bowling each year; and

Whereas bowling is an excellent form of exercise and recreation for all people regardless of age: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning January 4, 1987, is designated "National Bowling Week". The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 316, DESIGNATING THE SQUARE DANCE AS THE NATIONAL FOLK DANCE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 316) designating the square dance as the national folk dance of the United States for 1985 and 1986, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there has been testimony against this bill, and I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

NATIONAL ALOPECIA AREATA AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 299) to designate the week of December 7, 1986, through December 13, 1986, as "National Alopecia Areata Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. RES. 299

Whereas alopecia areata is a serious disease affecting approximately two million people;

Whereas alopecia areata, which usually afflicts children and young adults, causes severe and often permanent hair loss;

Whereas the coordinated efforts of support groups in forty-two States have helped thousands of people cope with the physical and emotional problems caused by alopecia areata;

Whereas much of the trauma associated with alopecia areata could be reduced through greater public awareness, understanding, and education; and

Whereas the cause of alopecia areata is unknown, and promising research efforts to find a cure for the disease should be promoted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of December 7, 1986, through December 13, 1986, is designated as "National Alopecia Areata Awareness Week" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL BURN AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 410) to designate the period commencing February 9, 1987, and ending February 15, 1987, as "National Burn Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. RES. 410

Whereas the burn problem in the United States is the worst of any industrialized nation in the world;

Whereas burn injuries are one of the leading causes of accidental death in the United States;

Whereas every year approximately two million people are victims of burn injury in the United States;

Whereas of these injuries, seventy thousand are hospitalized and account for nine million disability days annually;

Whereas approximately twelve thousand people die from burn injuries;

Whereas deaths resulting from burn injuries increased in 1985;

Whereas the rehabilitative and psychological impact of burns are devastating;

Whereas children, the elderly, and the disabled are most likely to suffer serious burns;

Whereas it is estimated that approximately 75 percent of all burns could be prevented by proper education of children and adults; and

Whereas there is a need for an effective national program that deals with all aspects of burn prevention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the period commencing February 9, 1987, and ending February 15, 1987, is designated as "National Burn Awareness Week" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and all Federal, State, and local government officials to observe such week with appropriate programs and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT SUNDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1986, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, WATER RESOURCES, CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1985

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight Sunday, October 12, 1986, to file the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6) "to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources and the improvement and rehabilitation of the Nation's water resources infrastructure."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1986, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1128, CLEAN WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1985

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight, Monday, October 13, 1986, to file the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1128) "an act to amend the Clean Water Act, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ADOPTION WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 306) to designate the week beginning November 23, 1986, as "National Adoption Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 651.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 651 designates Thanksgiving week—November 23 to 29, 1986, as "National

Adoption Week" and is intended to focus attention on the benefits of adoption to children, parents, and society in general. Similar legislation was approved by the Senate in April of this year.

Mr. Speaker, each year more than 100,000 children are adopted in the United States. For these children, adoption represents a chance to grow up in a home, with a family, among parents who love them. In my view, Mr. Speaker, nothing is more important, no one more precious, or vulnerable than children. For millions, adoption is their last best hope for a happy childhood.

National Adoption Week will, I believe, be very useful in highlighting the adoptable status of approximately 50,000 children with special needs—children who are older, handicapped, in sibling groups, or members of minorities—who are legally free for adoption. Passage of this resolution will send a message to the American people—these children with special needs are our children, too. They belong in families and we have a responsibility for them.

Mr. Speaker, as members know, most aspects of adoption are governed by State law. Landmark legislation, however, was adopted in 1980 in the form of the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act—Public Law 96-272. This law made numerous changes in the child welfare services and foster care programs. It also established the Adoption Assistance Program, a federally matched adoption subsidy for special needs children.

Today there are more than 2 million couples ready, willing, and eligible to adopt a child. The average wait for a newborn or very young child, however, is painfully long—5 to 7 years.

In light of this, many prospective, adoptive parents now look overseas to adopt and the number of foreign-born children eligible is rising. The Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, governs the admission of foreign-born children into the United States. Foreign adoptions generally take place in one of two ways. The first method is for the parents to work through a U.S.-based international, child-placing agency, which usually completes the adoption in the child's home country and brings the child to the United States. The second approach is for the adoptive parents to work directly with a foreign, child-placing entity, and either have the child brought to the United States for adoption, after all foreign and domestic requirements are fulfilled, or to journey to the child's country of origin and carry out the adoption there.

Just let me note here, Mr. Speaker, that every child desperately needs a home.

Every child needs the stability and guidance of loving parents.

Every child needs the sense of genuinely belonging, of being cared for, of being wanted.

National Adoption Week enables us all to applaud the generosity of adoptive parents, to commend assisting organizations such as the Adoptive Parents Committee, and to continue focusing on reforming the law to ensure that our adoption policies are the best we can craft.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 306

Whereas the week of November 23 has been commemorated as "National Adoption Week" for the past ten years;

Whereas we in Congress recognize the essential value of belonging to a secure, loving permanent family as every child's basic right;

Whereas approximately fifty thousand children who have special needs—school age, in sibling groups, members of minorities, or children with physical, mental, and emotional handicaps—are now in foster care or institutions financed at public expense and are legally free for adoption;

Whereas the adoption by capable parents of these institutionalized or foster care children into permanent, adoptive homes would insure the opportunity for their continued happiness and long-range well-being;

Whereas public and private barriers inhibiting the placement of these special needs children must be reviewed and removed where possible to assure these children's adoption;

Whereas the public and prospective parents must be informed of the availability of adoptive children;

Whereas a variety of media, agencies, adoptive parent and advocacy groups, civic and church groups, businesses, and industries will feature publicity and information to heighten community awareness of the crucial needs of waiting children; and

Whereas the recognition of Thanksgiving week "National Adoption Week" is in the best interest of adoptable children and the public in general: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of November 23 through November 29, 1986, hereby is designated "National Adoption Week", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HOME CARE WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J.

Res. 339) to designate the week of November 30, 1986, through December 6, 1986, as "National Home Care Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 339

Whereas organized home health care services to the elderly and disabled have existed in this country since the last quarter of the eighteenth century;

Whereas home health care, (including skilled nursing services, physical therapy, speech therapy, social services, occupational therapy, health counseling and education, and homemaker-home health aide services), is recognized as an effective and economical alternative to unnecessary institutionalization;

Whereas caring for the ill and disabled at home emphasizes the dignity and independence of the individual;

Whereas the Federal Government has supported home health services since the enactment of the medicare program, with the number of home health agencies providing services increasing from less than five hundred to more than five thousand; and

Whereas many private, public, and charitable organizations provide these and similar services to millions of patients each year preventing, postponing, and limiting the need for institutionalization and enabling such patients to remain independent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of November 30, 1986, through December 6, 1986, is designated as "National Home Care Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MADE IN AMERICA MONTH

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 392) to designate the month of December 1986 as "Made in America

Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of House Joint Resolution 688, along with my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], I rise in strong support of its passage.

This resolution would heighten public awareness on the importance of buying American by designating December as "Made in America" month.

Over the years, "Made in America" has been synonymous with quality because of the pride, skill, and craftsmanship of the American worker.

The American consumer, aware of that proud tradition, has consistently indicated that he or she would prefer to "buy American" if given a choice.

This resolution, by paying tribute to that history of dedication and commitment that makes American products unique, carries an important message.

And with record trade deficits each of the last 3 years, it is particularly timely.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with the gentleman from North Carolina, and with the American manufacturer and worker, in marking December as "Made in America" month.

As we turn into 1987, let this resolution send forth the message that "Made in America" still stands for pride and quality, and that it remains the smart buy to "buy American."

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution.

S.J. RES. 392

Whereas the trade deficit in our country in 1985 reached a record level of \$418,500,000,000;

Whereas the 1986 trade deficit is predicted to increase still further;

Whereas over 1,661,000 jobs have been lost in the manufacturing sector since 1972 as a direct result of imports;

Whereas imports now account for more than 20 per centum of all manufactured products sold in the United States;

Whereas imports continue to grow at an increasing rate and constitute a larger and larger percentage of all manufactured goods sold in this Nation;

Whereas the manufacturing sector of the United States economy is shrinking dramatically as a result of imports;

Whereas a continuing flood of imports of manufactured goods could permanently reduce the manufacturing capacity of our Nation and, as a direct result, threaten our ability to respond to a national emergency and make the United States highly vulnerable to embargoes of a wide range of products necessary for the national defense and

the smooth functioning of the national economy;

Whereas there is little awareness of the country of origin of most products sold in the United States; and

Whereas United States consumers should be aware of the impact that their purchase decisions could have on their own jobs and the economy as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the month of December 1986, "Made in America Month" and to call upon Federal, State, and local government agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 414) to designate March 16, 1987, as "Freedom of Information Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 414

Whereas a fundamental principle of our Government is that a well-informed citizenry can reach the important decisions that determine the present and future of the Nation;

Whereas the freedoms we cherish as Americans are fostered by free access to information;

Whereas many Americans, because they have never known any other way of life, take for granted the guarantee of free access to information that derives from the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the guarantee of free access to information should be emphasized and celebrated annually; and

Whereas March 16 is the anniversary of the birth of James Madison, one of the Founding Fathers, who recognized and supported the need to guarantee individual

rights through the Bill of Rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 16, 1987, is designated as "Freedom of Information Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon Federal, State, and local government agencies and the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF FIRST PRIME MINISTER OF STATE OF ISRAEL, DAVID BEN-GURION

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 422) commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of the first Prime Minister of the State of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 422

Whereas David Ben-Gurion is a man of great historical importance, not only to the Jewish people but also to all people striving for freedom;

Whereas his leadership made realizable in-gathering of the exiles that brought millions of homeless Jews scattered throughout the world to Israel where they were united both with each other and with their ancient homeland;

Whereas the Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel, a milestone in the life of David Ben-Gurion, echoes the American Declaration of Independence in its recognition of the universal equality of man;

Whereas as Israel's first Prime Minister and Minister of Defense, Ben-Gurion led the newly formed state through its most difficult period, directing the desperate efforts to secure Israel's survival and independence;

Whereas his pragmatic solutions to Israel's overwhelming problems, paralleled with his desire to create a society based on justice and peace, guided the fledgling state and formed the values on which Israel rests

today and the basis for what Israel strives for in the future;

Whereas Ben-Gurion's vision of the Greening of the Desert through the application of science and technology continues to be an important aspect of Israel, as well as a factor that can help solve food production problems in arid regions all over the world;

Whereas 1986 marks the hundredth anniversary of the birth of David Ben-Gurion, leader of his people for two generations; and

Whereas the United States and Israel share many of the same fundamental values of democracy and freedom, and a common history of accepting immigrants from all over the globe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress, in this the centennial of David Ben-Gurion's birth joins in the celebration of this great statesman, urges all Americans to take note of this commemoration, and applauds the David Ben-Gurion Centennial Committee of the United States of America in its work promoting the yearlong national celebration of David Ben-Gurion and his achievements.

(b) The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation in honor of this celebration.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1345

NATIONAL ARTS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 304) to designate the week of November 16, 1986, through November 22, 1986, as "National Arts Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite my colleagues to join with me in commemorating National Arts Week from November 16 through November 23, 1986. During this week, many special events and performances will be held to celebrate America's rich and diverse artistic heritage, to focus attention on the importance of the arts to our way of life, and to encourage corporate and individual investment in artistic activities.

The arts in America give expression to our national identity and contribute to our national mental health. They let us stand apart from the sometimes grim realities of life, to escape and to refresh our spirit. Paradoxically, the arts also allow us an increased understanding of the human condition.

In its first year, National Arts Week 1985 was very successful; more than 800 public arts events took place in each of the 50 States, with 100 proclamations from Governors and mayors across the country. This year, we hope for even greater support, and plan to focus particular attention on arts at the local level. By doing so, we can help create a permanent base of community support for the arts which can sustain them in this era of constraints on Federal funding.

The entire U.S. arts community has joined to support National Arts Week in a public/private partnership that encompasses Federal and State arts agencies, a special corporate committee, national arts groups, arts services organizations, and, particularly, local arts groups.

I should like to thank my colleagues who have cosponsored this important legislation and to express my special thanks to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. COELHO, who has been of so much assistance in bringing the bill to fruition. I am also very grateful to my colleague from New York, Mr. GARCIA, for bringing House Joint Resolution 693 to the floor with such dispatch. It is my pleasure to sponsor this legislation and to commemorate the role of the arts in America.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 304

Whereas the performing arts, the visual arts, and literature are central to human expression;

Whereas our identity as a people and as a Nation is expressed through the arts;

Whereas support of the arts has been a partnership of Federal, State, and local government entities, business, and individuals;

Whereas a congressionally declared National Arts Week provides a focal point to celebrate the diverse cultural heritage of the United States and the vitality of contemporary writers, artists, and performers; and

Whereas a congressionally proclaimed National Arts Week brings together the public and private sectors to restate support of the arts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of November 16, 1986, through November 22, 1986, is designated as "National Arts Week" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the citizens of the United States to observe such week with appropriate programs and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL WOMEN IN SPORTS DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 418) to designate February 4,

1987, as "National Women in Sports Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 418

Whereas women's athletics is one of the most effective avenues available through which women of America may develop self-discipline, initiative, confidence, and leadership skills;

Whereas support and fitness activity contributes to emotional and physical well-being and women need strong bodies as well as strong minds;

Whereas the history of women in sports is rich and long, but there has been little national recognition of the significance of women's athletic achievements;

Whereas the number of women in leadership positions of coaches, officials, and administrators has declined drastically over the last decade and there is a need to restore women to these positions to ensure a fair representation of women's abilities and to provide role models for young female athletes;

Whereas the bonds built between women through athletics help to break down the social barriers of racism and prejudice;

Whereas the communication and cooperation skills learned through athletic experience play a key role in the athlete's contributions at home, at work, and to society;

Whereas women's athletics has produced such winners as Flo Hyman, whose spirit, talent, and accomplishments distinguished her above others and exhibited for all of us the true meaning of fairness, determination, and team play;

Whereas early motor-skill training and enjoyable experiences of physical activity strongly influence life-long habits of physical fitness;

Whereas the athletic opportunities for male students at the collegiate and high school level remain significantly greater than those for female students; and

Whereas the number of funded research projects focusing on the specific needs of women athletes is limited and the information provided by these projects is imperative to the health and performance of future women athletes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February 4, 1987, is hereby designated as "National Women in Sports Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon local and State jurisdictions, appropriate Federal agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the

day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of House Resolution 740, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 418, which would designate February 4, 1987 as "National Women in Sports Day."

It is time to nationally recognize the significance of women's athletic achievements. By drawing attention to women in sports, we recognize the importance not only of our nationally known women athletes, but all women who participate in sports and physical conditioning programs. These athletic activities promote women's emotional and physical well-being, and build bonds between women that help to break down the social barriers of racism and prejudice.

National Women In Sports Day, while recognizing the outstanding accomplishments of women in sports, will also point to the fact that women students still have far fewer opportunities for athletic achievements than men at the same institutions. Colleges now spend more than 16 percent of their athletic budgets on women—up from 2 percent in 1972; the number of women in intercollegiate sports has grown from 16,000 in 1972 to more than 150,000 today. While I applaud the progress that has been made over the last 15 years, I believe we must also acknowledge the large inequities that still exist for women in the area of sports.

National Women in Sports Day will be a step toward giving women in sports the recognition and attention they deserve. Hopefully, this day will encourage more women to experience the pleasure of sports activity that develops life-long habits of physical fitness.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATING THE BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST PATENT AND FIRST COPYRIGHT LAWS

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 169) to commemorate the bicentennial anniversary of the first patent and the first copyright laws, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 169

Whereas the Constitution empowers Congress "To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries";

Whereas the enforcement of this constitutional principle through specific patent and copyright laws merits special recognition;

Whereas the first patent bill signed into law on April 10, 1790, and the first copyright bill was signed into law on May 31, 1790, and we will recognize the bicentennial anniversary of these laws in 1990: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That special recognition be given during 1990, the bicentennial year of the first patent and the first copyright laws, and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation upon the enactment of this joint resolution calling upon the people of the United States to foster such recognition through appropriate educational and cultural programs and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALUTE TO SCHOOL VOLUNTEERS DAY

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 407) designating November 12, 1986, as "Salute to School Volunteers Day," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 407 which designates November 12, 1986, as "Salute to School Volunteers Day."

Mr. Speaker, over 4 million unpaid citizen volunteers in thousands of our classrooms coast to coast enhance the quality of education of our instructional staff. This resolution recognizes and honors "the magnitude of quality and selflessness" of those who, in a long and honorable American tradition volunteer to help others.

These volunteers are a vital component in our education system today. They assist the professional educators in providing an effective educational experience as well as quality instruction.

Communities all across this country encourage business, civic groups, and local organizations to create a partnership with their schools.

Thousands of State and community volunteers have enriched student learning through their hard work and dedication while assisting our professional educators.

Senate Joint Resolution 407 provides national recognition of and support for this school volunteers movement which is now sweeping our country. They are helping our dedicated professional educators to reach and teach our children and young people who will determine the quality of America's future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution which salutes our school volunteers.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the joint resolution designating November 12, 1986 as "Salute to School Volunteers Day."

The resolution provides national recognition of and support for one of the truly remarkable features of the school reform movement which is now sweeping the country, namely, an explosion of citizen volunteerism on behalf of better schools for our children.

Sparked by the National School Volunteer Program, spontaneous local school-sponsored efforts, and a host of school-business partnerships and adopt-a-school programs in hundreds of communities, volunteers—over 4 million of them—are helping our dedicated professional staffs to reach and teach the children and youth who will determine the quality of America's future.

The resolution recognizes and honors "the magnitude, quality and selflessness" of those who, in a long and honorable American tradition, volunteer to help others. I believe that it will encourage more school districts and States to setup volunteer efforts and, in that way, tap the wisdom and skills of millions of Americans who care about our schools.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this joint resolution providing that November 12, 1986 be observed throughout the Nation as "Salute to School Volunteers Day."

I am particularly pleased that the resolution under consideration is identical to House Joint Resolution 706 which I introduced on August 12, 1986.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. Res. 407

Whereas the success of America's schools stems from the competence and dedication of their instructional staffs, combined with the commitment of students, parents, and other community members;

Whereas citizen volunteers are a vital component of an effective educational experience, assisting professional educators to deliver quality instructional services;

Whereas many States and communities have demonstrated that citizen volunteers in the classroom enhance, extend, and enrich student learning as they contribute to the work of dedicated professional educators;

Whereas numerous communities encourage groups, such as business and civic groups, to create mutually beneficial working partnerships with their schools, thus offering positive support from the community which, in turn, both encourages staff and benefits the students;

Whereas the Congress recognizes that four million unpaid citizen volunteers in thousands of classrooms coast to coast contribute daily to the enhancement of the quality of instruction in our schools and thus, to the development of an educated citizenry; and

Whereas the magnitude, quality, and selflessness of these contributions of America's citizen school volunteers merit the highest appreciation and gratitude: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That November 12, 1986, is designated as Salute to School Volunteers Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATING REQUIREMENT RELATING TO DECENNIAL CENSUSES OF DRAINAGE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2722) to amend title 13, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement relating to decennial censuses of drainage, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "drainage," and inserting in lieu thereof a period" and insert "drainage".

Page 1, after line 9, insert: (b) The heading of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 13, United States Code, is amended by striking out "DRAINAGE".

Page 1, line 10, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object, but rise in support of H.R. 2722, to amend title 13, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement relating to decennial censuses of drainage.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING COMMISSION ON THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3559) to amend the Act establishing a Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States to clarify the status of employees of the Commission, to raise the limits on private contributions, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, line 15, after "logo", insert:

Such rules and regulations shall provide, among other things, that all projects, goods, and services as to which use of the logo is authorized shall be educational or commemorative, and shall relate to the bicentennial of the United States Constitution, the establishment of the Federal Government, or the Bill of Rights, and none of such projects, goods or services shall exploit the United States Constitution or the Bill of Rights. The purpose of the Commission in authorizing use of the logo shall not be primarily or exclusively to raise funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker; however I shall not object, but rise in support of H.R. 3559, to amend the act establishing a Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States to clarify the status of employees of the Commission, to raise the limits on private contributions, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. Boggs].

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the majority side and the minority side, not only the members of the committee, but the members of their excellent staffs for bringing to a happy conclusion the legislation that makes it possible for the U.S. Commission on the Bicentennial celebration of the Constitution to go forward in an orderly manner so that next year in 1987 we will be able to celebrate the signing of the Constitution, and in 1988 the ratification of the Constitution, and in 1989, of course, the establishment of the Government, including this branch of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations and my gratitude to each of you and to all of you and I am very pleased to have had this opportunity to say so.

Mr. HANSEN. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to

the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Utah, for yielding.

I would just like to say that I think the best thing that the Bicentennial Commission on the Constitution has ever done is appoint our colleague from this Chamber, the gentlewoman from Louisiana, because she has done more for that Bicentennial Commission than any other person in this Congress. I think it is a tribute to her and her hard work.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I concur in the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the various pieces of commemorative legislation just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE

(Without objection, Mr. WALKER was allowed to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of ascertaining the schedule from the majority leader, and I am very glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader to indicate to the House what the schedule for the upcoming week may be.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the schedule is that upon completion of today's session, we will be adjourned until noon on Tuesday next. Monday is Columbus Day and Yom Kippur, so we will adjourn upon conclusion of our business today until Tuesday noon.

There are 10 bills that are listed on the Suspension Calendar, as follows:

S. 740, Emergency Wetlands Act;
S. 1352, Sikes Act reauthorization;
H.R. 4531, Wetlands Loan Act;
H.R. 4175, maritime authorizations;
H.R. 2205, Korean War Memorial bill;

H.R. , Small Business Administration Pilot Program extension;

S. 2245, Export Administration authorization;

H.R. 3113, conference report on Coordinated Operations Agreement, Suisun Marsh Preservation Agreement and Small Reclamation Projects Act;

H.R. 1390, El Portal Leases, California; and

S. 2216, designate September 17 as Constitution Day.

There may be others. We will debate those bills, and postpone any votes until the conclusion of the debates.

Members should be advised that there will be three conference committee reports to be considered, one on the water resources bill, one on surface transportation, and one on the clean water amendments. Those are three significant pieces of legislation. Taken in tandem with the bill passed this week by the House on the cleanup of spills, they amount to significant environmental programming.

Members must expect that there will have to be action on the debt limit extension, on the budget reconciliation bill, and on the continuing appropriations. Once those are concluded, we would expect to adjourn sine die. We hope that might occur by midweek.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Just a couple questions, with regard to additional bills that might be put on the Suspension Calendar, can the gentleman give us some idea as to what kind of notice we might get about additional bills, since most of the Members will not come back to town until Tuesday morning?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, at this point it is a little difficult to say. I do not know of any other bills, to tell the gentleman the truth. There may be some, however, because always at this point in the session the leadership discovers bills lying around ready for action that it had not anticipated, so I do not have any way of knowing.

Mr. WALKER. I would assume that would be brought, though, onto the calendar in accordance with the regular procedure of working with the minority leader for adequate notice.

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes. We will do our very best not to spring any surprises; but the majority leader is likely to be surprised himself when he discovers what is on the calendar.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman.

The conference reports listed, are they likely to come up on Tuesday?

Mr. WRIGHT. We hope they can. We think they have either been completed or are at a stage where completion is clearly anticipated by the end of the day.

It is my understanding that the Rules Committee is in the process of drafting rules for all three and that those rules anticipate the presentation of the conference reports on Tuesday.

Mr. WALKER. So we would certainly get the rule on the conference re-

ports on Tuesday and perhaps the conference reports themselves.

With regard to the budget reconciliation bill, it is my understanding that will have to be voted on in the Senate before we would get it, which means that it will be likely that we would not get the budget reconciliation bill until Wednesday, is that the likelihood?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, it is altogether possible that it may be Wednesday. It is conceivable that it may be Tuesday.

It is my understanding that there is some movement in the direction of an agreement, but I am not at liberty to promise.

Mr. WALKER. But we are correct that the Senate would have to act first, the other body would have to act first on that legislation?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, the gentleman may be absolutely correct.

Mr. WALKER. With regard to the debt limit extension, that will have to follow the budget reconciliation bill, so that could possibly come as late as Thursday?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the debt limit extension might come earlier than that. The Rules Committee has a rule prepared to present on the debt limit extension.

I think I may have misled the gentleman in my reference to three bills on which rules already have been prepared by the Rules Committee. The third one to which I had reference was not the surface transportation bill, but rather the debt limit extension instead.

So far as I know, there is no rule yet on the surface transportation bill.

Mr. WALKER. So the gentleman would anticipate the debt limit extension perhaps as early as Tuesday or Wednesday?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WALKER. And the continuing appropriations resolution, is it my understanding that because of potential scope problems that we would probably have to have a rule for it before it could come to the floor?

Mr. WRIGHT. I imagine that a rule would be necessary for the continuing resolution.

Mr. WALKER. And the one item that I noticed was not on the gentleman's list of potential conference reports is the drug bill. Does the gentleman have any information about what the House might expect in terms of having a drug conference report before us next week?

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, I do not have any information that is not available to other Members.

I think we have two clear possibilities, either that the other body would accept our bill as we passed it, a matter that most Members of the House would prefer, no doubt, or that they might change or remove one or more portions of it and return it with

those changes. I do not know which to anticipate.

I have talked with the majority leader and the minority leader of the other body and I have no clear signal as to what to expect.

Mr. WALKER. So what we might really expect is further action on Senate amendments, is that more likely?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is possible.

Mr. WALKER. One other question that occurs to this gentleman as I look at the list, are we anticipating that we will finish next week and that Congress can adjourn sine die by the end of the week, whatever that end of the week might be?

Mr. WRIGHT. I should be very disappointed if we are not able to do that. I know all Members desire to do that. I believe I see light at the end of the tunnel. I think we ought to anticipate being able to finish by Wednesday, or if not, then by Thursday.

□ 1400

I cannot make that ironclad promise, of course, because to do so would be to speak for a lot of other Members, but I think that any reasonable expectation would look toward our being able to adjourn sine die next week.

Mr. WALKER. Members should keep their schedules in the district flexible at least through Thursday?

Mr. WRIGHT. That would be my advice.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for the schedule.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1986

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DISAGREEING TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 668, PUBLIC DEBT INCREASE

Mr. BEILENSEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-988) on the resolution (H. Res. 586) providing for taking the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 668) increasing the statutory limit on the public debt with the Senate amendment from the Speaker's table and disagreeing to the Senate amendment, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1985, AND AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF SUCH CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BEILENSEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-989) on the resolution (H. Res. 587) waiving certain points of order against the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources and the improvement and rehabilitation of the Nation's water resources infrastructure, and against the consideration of such conference report, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1128, CLEAN WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1985, AND AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF SUCH CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BEILENSEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-990) on the resolution (H. Res. 588) waiving certain points of order against the conference report on the bill (S. 1128) to amend the Clean Water Act, and against the consideration of such conference report, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DESIGNATION OF HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS UNTIL NOON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 10, 1986.

I hereby designate the Honorable THOMAS S. FOLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions until noon on Tuesday, October 14, 1986.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2638, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1987

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, S. 2638, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 4354, which passed the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DEDICATION OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY MEDICAL CENTER IN CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the dedication on October 23, 1986, of the John F. Kennedy Medical Center, located in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent.

Formerly known as the Northwest Hospital, this medical institution has provided outstanding quality health care for more than three decades for the people of the city of Chicago, and its renaming has been inspired by the numerous improvements in services and many accomplishments of the hospital during the last few years. Exemplifying the spirit of our late President, John F. Kennedy, the executive director of the hospital, Peter Rusin, obtained the endorsement of the Kennedy family in renaming the hospital in honor of President Kennedy.

A copy of the board of trustees resolution renaming the hospital follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF NORTHWEST HOSPITAL

Whereas, for the past several years, Northwest Hospital has undergone structural and personnel changes, including but not limited to the reorganization of the Laboratory, X-Ray, Anesthesia, Emergency Room and Physical Therapy Departments; and

Whereas, the medical staff has been restructured and now has a youthful, energetic image reflecting the religious, ethnic and democratic characteristics of the neighborhood; and

Whereas, former President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, symbolized the characteristics of youth, energy, progress and integrity, and further, because of his support and concern for the health and welfare of the American public, he utilized his influence for the promotion of programs for the benefit of increased and improved health care for all people; and

Whereas, the hospital serves persons of all ages, ethnic and religious beliefs, regardless of race, color or creed; and

Whereas, the hospital is vitally concerned with furnishing the best possible medical and hospital care for those patients; and

Whereas, the officers and trustees of the hospital have voiced their admiration for the late John F. Kennedy and for his ideals and concern for those citizens in need of medical attention; and

Whereas, the trustees of the hospital deem it appropriate and fitting that the name of the hospital be changed to reflect their admiration and appreciation for the efforts made by John F. Kennedy on behalf of quality health care; and

Whereas, it is appropriate and fitting that this name reflects the new beginning of this hospital which has risen from the changes mentioned above; and

Whereas, the name John F. Kennedy symbolizes our mission of providing a high quality, cost effective continuum of health care services, which is accessible to all, and which meets the needs of our community: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Trustees of the hospital that the name of Northwest Hospital be changed to John F. Kennedy Medical Center, and that all legal steps statutorily required be taken to effectuate such change in the spirit of the recitals of the preambles forming part of this Resolution.

During the last 6 years, Northwest Hospital has restructured and improved several of its medical departments, and has engaged in an ambitious plan to develop new programs and acquire the latest medical technology, which will enable the John F. Kennedy Medical Center to provide our community with the most advanced medical services available. A summary of the major improvements and accomplishments of the Northwest Hospital since 1980 follows:

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS AT NORTHWEST HOSPITAL SINCE 1980

ORGANIZATION/ADMINISTRATION

Completed reorganization of the Board of Trustees.

Appointed Mrs. Lucy Wolski as assistant administrator.

Completed extensive management reorganization which included the appointments of six vice presidents.

Engaged the services of Kevin B. Tynan and Associates, marketing firm, to reassess and develop marketing strategy.

Engaged the services of Coopers and Lybrand, management consulting firm, to assist in long-range strategic planning.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT CHANGES

Re-organized Anesthesia Department. Dr. Anastacio Saavedra, formerly of the University of Illinois, appointed director of anesthesia.

Restructured Radiology Department. Dr. Perry Rudich, formerly of Michael Reese Hospital, appointed director of radiology.

Appointed Dr. Ebrahim Amir-Mokri as director of surgical and clinical pathology.

Appointed Dr. Michael Rosenberg as director of emergency room services.

Dedicated Endoscopy Lab in the name of the late Dr. Eli Samet.

Completed development of strong quality assurance and physician peer review process.

NEW DEPARTMENTS

Extended Care Unit, Family MedCenter, Free-to-Be Child Care Center, Gift Gallery, Medical Library, Same-Day Surgery Department, and 24-hour Surveillance Unit.

DEPARTMENTS RESTRUCTURED AND OR WITH

NEW DEPARTMENT HEADS

Accounting, Dietary, Marketing, Medical Records, Microbiology, Pharmacy, Physical Therapy, Quality Assurance, Respiratory Therapy, Social Service, and Training and Education.

MAJOR EQUIPMENT ACQUISITIONS

Northwest Hospital was first hospital in Chicago to implement computerized cardiac monitoring system (CAMS).

Cardiac Resuscitator put into use.

PHYSICAL PLANT CHANGES

Emergency Room moved to a new location with 15 patient stations, 2 fully equipped trauma rooms, and ENT (ear, nose and throat) area.

Seven story pavilion completed with 16 surgical suites, 170 patient beds, 12 surgical intensive care beds, 16 recovery beds, 20-bed surgical surveillance area, and offices, classrooms, auditorium.

Major Avenue annex opened to house business functions.

Remodelled employee and guest dining room, lobby and patient lounges.

Built an eight-level garage providing free parking for outpatients, visitors and employees.

Remodelled Physical Therapy, Obstetrics and Pediatrics departments.

Dedicated new chapel to Lillian and A. L. Salzman.

OTHER DEPARTMENTAL CHANGES

Computerized Medical Laboratory.

Expanded Physical Therapy department.

Implemented triage system of patient care to expedite emergency services.

Computerized patient admitting system.

COMMUNITY HEALTH PROGRAMS

First Children's and Adult Health Fairs.

Launched series of extensive community health events.

Screenings, cataract and glaucoma, hearing, diabetes, blood pressure, prostate cancer, skin cancer, colo-rectal cancer, testicular cancer, lectures, eye health, arthritis, medication, Medicare, sexuality, and other topics.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the dedication later this month of the John F. Kennedy Medical Center in Chicago, I congratulate executive director Peter Rusin, the members of the board of trustees, and all of the members of the staff at the hospital, as well as the

dedicated volunteers, for their exemplary efforts in providing our community with the very best in health care, and I extend to them my best wishes for future success as they continue to serve our community and the city of Chicago by providing in the future, as they have in the past, the finest and most up-to-date hospital and medical services.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained off the Hill on official business during rollcall votes 458 and 459. Had I been present I would have voted yea on rollcall 458 and nay on rollcall 459.

ARKANSAS SHOWING THE WAY TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, this week the affordable housing work of two groups of West Memphis and Crittenden County Arkansans earned national recognition. I bring this to the attention of the House because I believe my colleagues will be interested in their accomplishments.

On Monday Samuel R. Pierce, Jr., U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, as a part of the observation of the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless, announced awards to 150 local projects, spotlighting their efforts to improve shelter and services for low-income people. Two of these awards went to projects based in West Memphis. Both involve not only West Memphians, but people from other parts of Crittenden County.

The oldest of the efforts has generated affordable housing in a Neighborhood Development Area of southeastern West Memphis. The second project is West Memphis Private/Public Sector Home Improvement Program which aids low-income homeowners to obtain affordable home improvements.

The oldest of the projects, Affordable Housing—the Crittenden County Experience, took root in 1982 nurtured by lessons learned through a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development sponsored demonstration at Harvard Yard in Crittenden County.

West Memphis homebuilders and industry leaders Don Butler and Jack Avery recognized the desperate need for affordable housing for potential low-income home buyers. They were convinced that members of the Crittenden County Home Builders Association could successfully transfer the experience of Harvard Yard to nearby West Memphis if State and local regulations could be improved to allow new construction on smaller-sized residential lots.

Under the leadership of Don, who is now president of the Arkansas Home Builders Association, and Jack, who is president of the Crittenden County Home Builders Association, the CCHBA convinced West Memphis officials to give it a try. Thus far, about 40 low-income

home-buyer affordable houses have been built in the southeastern section of West Memphis. And, similar homes are going up elsewhere in the city and Crittenden County.

The attractive homes range in price from \$22,900 for a two-bedroom house to \$38,800 for a three-bedroom, two-bath house.

So successful has been the Crittenden County experience with construction of affordable housing, local builders are regularly requested to provide briefings and technical assistance to their colleagues and to local government leaders in Arkansas and many places across the Nation.

In 1985, the National Association of Home Builders awarded the Crittenden County Home Builders Association first place in its small associations in the builder category for working with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and local and State government officials to eliminate unnecessary construction regulations in connection with accomplishing the affordable housing program.

That same year, NAHB gave its "Building Better Communities" Grand Award, in the nonbuilders category, to John Suskie manager of the Little Rock office of HUD. He was recognized for promoting use throughout Arkansas of innovative methods and solutions employed in the Harvard Yard demonstration.

The West Memphis Private/Public Sector Home Improvement Program is a private and public sector cooperative program sponsored by the Community Housing Resources Board of West Memphis, Inc. This program won 1 of 16 Special Merit Awards presented by Secretary Pierce.

In January 1985, the West Memphis Community Development Agency proposed the program which brings together low-income homeowners, lending institutions, and home improvement contractors.

In addition to officers and executive board members of the Community Housing Resources Board, primary participants in the affordable home improvements project include low-income homeowners, representatives of private sector lenders, five small construction firms and the West Memphis city government.

During the first 18 months of the program, more than 70 homeowners, most of whom live in predominantly black, lower income neighborhoods were enabled to improve their homes. The project hopes to increase this number to 90 by the end of this year.

The partnership works with program applicants to pull together a combination of grant and loan funds and contributions by the homeowners. Thirty-eight of the first group of families participating obtained private sector loans, 28 families were able to make cash contributions to the cost of their home improvement repairs, and 7 received a basic emergency grant of \$1,500 each.

West Memphis' Community Development Agency uses Federal community development block grant funds to make home improvement grants, to assist with loan financing and to pay a portion of unforeseen job costs arising from problems identified after the private sector loan closing.

The average cost of the home improvement jobs has been \$5,150. The range of monthly loan repayments has been \$30 to \$100, with

the average being \$57 per month. Other statistics of interest in connection with this program include:

Forty percent of the households involved had incomes below the poverty level;

Ninety percent of the households have had incomes below the HUD very-low-income limits;

Ninety percent of the households have been headed by minorities;

Eighty percent of the households have been headed by women; and,

Seventy percent of the households have been headed by persons who are 60 years old or older.

All such programs have their share of statistics, but the bottom line of this program is people. Comments from two participating homeowners show the kind of impact it is making on the lives of the participating families. "Before, the children would hide from school friends passing by," one homeowner said in talking about the improvements to the family's home. "Now, they hurry home from school and sit proudly on the front steps."

Another homeowner participating had the following to say: "It would rain in the house, and I'd jump out of bed to put down all my pots and pans to catch the leaks. I was so used to doing this that I still wake up at night before remembering that it's not going to rain in my house any more. I praise the Lord!"

In addition to aiding low-income homeowners to afford home repair improvements, the program is designed to provide employment and training for minority contractors and the workers.

The workers use low-cost materials and traditional construction techniques and skills to demonstrate methods of accomplishing affordable home improvements.

This week's awards to the two West Memphis programs have demonstrated that sheer hard work, determination, innovation and co-operation between the private and public sectors can provide affordable home buying and home repair improvement opportunities for low-income Arkansans and Americans.

At this time, I would like to make a part of the RECORD the summaries on these two programs which were published by HUD in connection with the awards made by Secretary Pierce.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING—THE CRITTENDEN COUNTY EXPERIENCE

Local builders Don Butler and Jack Avery, recognizing the desperate need for decent housing in the southeastern section of West Memphis and demonstrating the marketability of the affordable housing concept, obtained permission from West Memphis officials to build such housing on available lots in this Neighborhood Development Program area. The affordable housing concept, a scaled-down version of the "typical" American home, is designed to provide decent shelter with sufficient amenities and visual appeal to be marketable but at a price affordable to lower income people. When constructed in existing lower income neighborhoods as in-fill, it is an extremely practical means of improving the neighborhood and increasing the housing supply for lower income people. Since 1984 almost 40 homes have been built in the area. The lowest price for a two-bedroom home was \$22,900; the

highest price for a three-bedroom, two-bath home was \$38,800.

In many cases, dilapidated and condemned housing was torn down to provide buildable lots for these new units, and in a few instances individuals who owned the lots used their value as down payment and closing costs for the new home. Families who do not have enough cash for the down payment and closing costs may provide some or all of it through a "sweat equity" program, which allows them to do a part of the work, such as interior painting or landscaping, and receive credit for the value of their work toward the cash necessary for the required investment. Over 90 percent of the purchasers are first-time home buyers. Some were previously living with parents; several are single-parent households. Without the availability of these units, home ownership would have been an impossibility for most.

The project significantly increases the availability of decent housing for lower income people in West Memphis and is an ongoing process that will continue to provide new housing. Funding for the project is through various FHA subsidies and Community Development Block Grants. The housing in this project is made affordable primarily through design considerations for eliminating waste and the relatively small size of the units. Also, constructing the homes in a developed area with existing infrastructure and on small lots helps to hold down cost. Since this housing project involves new housing construction, it has a substantial impact in the community through the construction jobs that it generates.

WEST MEMPHIS PRIVATE/PUBLIC SECTOR HOME IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Community Housing Resources Board of West Memphis, Inc., demonstrates the feasibility of a private/public sector home improvement program. In January 1985, the Community Development Agency (CDA) of West Memphis began to outline a new program that would make it easier for low-income homeowners to obtain home improvement loans from private lending institutions. Following 3 months of planning, the first private sector home improvement loan was made. Since then, 71 households have been able to improve their homes because of this partnership of low-income families, two local lending institutions, five small construction firms, and the CDA. Improvements in the predominantly black lower income neighborhoods of West Memphis are evident. By January 1987, the West Memphis private/public home improvement program will have helped approximately 90 low-income homeowners repair their houses.

The partnership also provides employment and training for minority contractors and their work forces. Traditional construction techniques, methods, and skills applied by local workers using low-cost materials serve to demonstrate and extend affordable construction practices. Private lenders and low-income homeowners gain first time experience in dealing with one another. In addition to learning to manage their loans, the owners are instructed in the maintenance of their homes. In its totality, including the use of construction standards appropriate to affordable housing repair, the West Memphis private/public partnership constitutes a new local policy for the encouragement of affordable improvements to existing housing.

NEW IDEAS VERSUS NEW TAXES: THE CHOICE FOR 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take all of the time, but I appreciate your recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, this special order is entitled "New Ideas Versus New Taxes: The Choice for 1986."

The key choice for America in 1986 is whether to move forward to new ideas and an opportunity society, or back to the liberal welfare state government of the 1970's, and pay for it through new taxes. The real choice is the future versus the past.

The 99th Congress might be called "the inconclusive Congress." It has been inconclusive because power in America is trapped between the will of the people and the will of the liberal welfare state government and interest groups.

In 1984, the American people voted, 49 States to 1, for new ideas in an opportunity society at the Presidential level. In 1984, the opportunity society candidate, Ronald Reagan, received 59 percent of the popular vote. He received an overwhelming majority in every region: 54 percent in the East, 60 percent in the Midwest, 63 percent in the West, and 62 percent in the South.

Reagan's popular victory was the fourth victory won against the liberal welfare state in the last five Presidential elections.

Analysts forget that Lyndon Johnson's 1964 landslide was the last mandate for a liberal welfare state in American elections. In 1968, the two antiliberal welfare state candidates, Nixon and Wallace, received 57 percent of the vote, while Humphrey, the liberal welfare state candidate, only received 43 percent of the vote. While the Nixon-Humphrey race was close, it has been clear in consequent elections that Wallace's 14 percent was an antiliberal welfare state vote, because they have all gone against the liberal Democrats in every Presidential election since.

In 1972, the liberal welfare state candidate, George McGovern, only received 38 percent of the vote.

In 1976, the choice was confused by the fact that Jimmy Carter had campaigned as a populist, commonsense, Southern Democrat, who won the nomination by opposing liberal candidates. In the fall election, many conservative Democrats found Carter acceptable, and he received 50 percent of the national vote, to Ford's 48 percent. However, note that even with a Southern semiconservative candidate, the Democrats could only receive 50 percent of the vote, and that is the high-water mark for the Democratic Party in five elections for President.

By 1980, the liberal welfare state was collapsing, with 13-percent inflation, 22-percent interest rates, rising unemployment, American helicopters burning in the Iranian desert, a Soviet Army in Afghanistan, and a Communist government taking over Nicaragua.

The American people in 1980 rejected the liberal welfare state and the Democrats. The Democratic nominee received only 41 percent of the vote in 1980.

In 1984, the liberal Democrats promised to raise taxes and to return to weakness in foreign policy, and the American people repudiated them. Walter Mondale received only 39 percent of the popular vote.

Thus, in the five Presidential elections since 1968, the Democrats have averaged only 42 percent of the vote. Fifty-eight percent of the American people have rejected the liberal welfare state Democratic Party on the average for five Presidential elections. That is a 20-year pattern of almost three out of every five Americans rejecting the liberal welfare state and its primary advocate, the liberal Democrats at the Presidential level.

If for 20 years the American people have been voting against the liberal welfare state, how has it survived? Even more incredibly, how has the liberal welfare state managed to grow and have taxes raised on the American people to finance it?

Consider how remarkable an achievement the liberal welfare state survival is. For 20 years the American people have voted against the past and for the future. For 20 years, the American people have voted to protect their family budgets against tax increases.

□ 1410

For 20 years, the American people have voted to shrink the Federal budget rather than the family budget. For 20 years, the American people have voted to shift from welfare to work fare.

Despite the clear 58-percent vote for change, the liberal welfare state has survived and flourished. Indeed, the liberal welfare state has grown and taxes have gone up.

Today, the Federal Government takes up a greater share of our incomes than ever before in peacetime.

How has the liberal welfare state avoided the popular will and how is it that the American people have voted for 20 years by 58-percent margins to go in one direction while their Government has gone in a different direction? The answer is to be found in the reality of incumbent advantage.

As David Broder wrote last spring, it is clear that incumbent advantage has slowed down the rate of political realignment. The Presidency is now the office most open to the popular will. Senate seats have shown themselves

to be fairly open to popular will. In 1980 there was a decisive shift of Senate seats away from liberal welfare state Democrats and toward opportunity society Republicans. In 1980, Senate incumbents were about 5 times as vulnerable to change as House incumbents.

Today the U.S. House of Representatives is the least vulnerable to change of the three elected Federal offices. Where the Founding Fathers expected the House to be the people's House and, in fact, the most open to change, it has become the incumbent's House and is now the least exposed to the people's will.

How did this happen? After the 1974 Watergate elections the Democrats found themselves in possession of a number of Republican seats because of the unique circumstances of that election, the combination of the oil price shock, the economic pain, and Watergate itself. Freshman Democrats were both very numerous and very scared. They knew that if the elections in 1976 were held as they normally would be, if the incumbent had the normal advantages that 30,000 or 40,000 Democrats would be defeated because they were occupying very Republican seats, that they held only because of scandal and recession.

The result was that the freshman Democrats decided their No. 1 challenge was to build up the incumbent advantages so that they would never face a fair fight. There was a deliberate effort in 1975 and 1976 to increase the office staffs, to increase the mailing privileges, to increase the amount of money available for travel to give the incumbent in effect an official tax paid campaign in addition to what they would face during the election cycle. The result was that in race after race in 1976 and beyond Democrats who were very liberal retained seats in Republican districts that are very conservative. In fact, this incumbency advantage has developed to such a degree that in 1984 Ronald Reagan carried more Democratic seats than he carried Republican seats. Literally, the President of the United States carried more Democratic congressional districts than he carried Republican congressional districts or than there are Republican congressional districts. Ronald Reagan carried 182 Republican congressional districts and he carried 189 Democratic congressional districts. If it had been a parliamentary election in the British or the German sense, the Republican margin in the House today would be 391 seats. But, in fact, because of reapportionment, because of incumbent advantages, because of approximately \$1 million in publicity, direct mail, staff, office accounts and other advantages, no incumbent runs as an equal. I say this as a Republican and it is true for all of us.

But if the Congress has been in a 20-year cycle of voting against Democrats, it is the liberal welfare state Democratic incumbents who have been peculiarly helped by being helped through reapportionment and State legislatures, and through incumbent advantages of the taxpayer paid accounts to have an advantage. If you consider this willingness to use, in effect, official advantages to try to rig the election by ensuring that the average voter does not have a really fair choice, that the incumbent Democrats will first start with about \$1 million in advantages, and those built up over the years, and then the election starts so that the challenger has almost no real hope of running a serious competitive race in most congressional districts right now, then you can understand why the country, the Nation, the American people can vote 58 percent against the liberal welfare state again and again and again, while at the same time House Democrats just ignore the votes and go about voting for tax increases, for a bigger liberal welfare state and for more government.

In this same setting, the same psychology of the incumbents being able to ignore the will of the people, one has to look at the current argument about whether or not people who are dead or people who have moved away should be taken off the voting rolls. There has been a remarkable process in the last 2 weeks in Democrats with a totally straight face have argued that taking dead people off the voter rolls is clearly an effort to intimidate voters, in effect, that there is a civil right to vote after you die.

Why are they making this argument? The reason is very simple. They know, according to the U.S. attorney for northern Illinois, that in 1982 Democrats stole about 100,000 votes; that is, in the election for Governor in Illinois, which was won by about 5,000 votes, the Democratic candidate received approximately 100,000 votes of people that had either died or moved away. Expressways have been voted, vacant lots have been voted, empty buildings have been voted, and in one case I can cite a person who died and voted in six consecutive Democratic primaries after they were dead, no mean achievement.

In that setting, let me suggest that had the dead and the moved voters not been voted illegally that the Democratic nominee for Governor would have lost by 105,000, a rather significant difference between a very close squeaker of 5,000 and the much larger loss of 105,000.

In Louisiana, in the last decade, two Members of the U.S. House of Representatives have resigned from their seats under indictment for stealing an election. One of the two subsequently

went to jail for having stolen an election.

In Indiana just this year Democratic election officials in southern Indiana have been indicted by a Federal grand jury for buying votes and for being involved in trying to steal an election.

This is a very important question. If one of the purposes of a democracy is to have only live voters allowed to vote and to have honest elections where your vote counts, it is very clear at the national level when the margin is 58 percent against the liberal welfare state and 42 percent for the liberal welfare state Democrats that it is impossible to steal a national election on that scale. But when that popular will gets down to a local congressional race or a local State legislative race, 5,000 illegal votes, 5,000 dead voters can make a big difference. In effect, the incumbency advantage and the dead voter, former voter advantage of legal elections that are stolen are two of the major ways in which the liberal welfare state Democrats have propped up the past.

The process that is underway is fascinating. If you think about it, the Republican Party has become a opportunity society party of the future, a party of new ideas, a party trying to change the Government. We are out trying to encourage young people to register to vote because we are getting something like 65 percent of the young people who register to vote Republican.

At the very same time, the Democratic Party, which has become the party of the past, a Democratic Party that props up a liberal welfare state that is now 30 or 40 years old, that party seeks to keep people voting after they die so that, in effect, the Democratic Party wants to use the votes of the dead to seize power from the votes of the young so that they can continue the Government of the past and stop the development of the future.

In this setting, one of the statements made by the U.S. attorney from northern Illinois is particularly important. He said the only way you can ensure honest elections is to purge voting rolls every 2 years so that there is not a pool of dead and moved voters for the local official to use illegally on election night. If the only people on the rolls are real people who are really eligible to vote, then the election official, even if he is tempted to steal the election, finds it very difficult to set up an election theft. But if you have a voter roll that has 20,000 or 50,000 or 100,000 dead people and people who have moved away sitting on that roll, then the temptation for a liberal welfare state Democrat to save the past by voting the past is very, very powerful indeed.

□ 1440

Now in that setting, we should be reminded of Lord Acton's warning that "power tends to corrupt, and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely." There was a certain level of chutzpa in having machine Democrats, people who had been elected in a long tradition that goes back to Tammany Hall, to the Cook County machine of Mayor Daley in Chicago, to the stolen elections in Texas of Lyndon Johnson.

To have those kinds of machine Democrats go to the news media with a straight face and pretend that the right of dead people to stay on the rolls is a civil rights issue, only at a time when they had lost any sense, I think, of reasonable, common morality could a politician go and make the case with a perfectly straight face that it is wrong to take dead people and people who have moved away off the rolls, and it is wrong to be concerned, to have an honest election.

The fact is, the Democrats do not have much choice. When you are faced with five consecutive repudiations by the American people at the Presidential level, when it is clear in every poll that the American people want workfare, not welfare, that the American people want smaller government, not higher taxes; that the American people want a strong foreign policy, not the weakness of the liberal welfare state.

When it is clear from every poll that the values and the dreams of the American people rest in an opportunity society future, not a liberal welfare state past, then if you are the Democrats, you have a very difficult time finding a majority coalition.

The fact is, the Democrats want to protect the liberal welfare state Government of the 1970s; the Republicans, and I think the American people, want to create the opportunity society of the 1990s.

Why is this all so important? How does it relate to 1986? This is not just a game; what Frank Kent in a book written in the twenties called *The Great Game of Politics*. This is the fundamental choice of the American people between the past and the future. It is the fundamental choice of the baby boom generation and its children, of where do we go as a country in the nineties.

To understand how fundamental that choice is, let me carry you back to 1965. Measure in your own mind if I am describing America as you have lived through it for the last 21 years:

Around 1965 the baby boom generation had gained enough momentum and was large enough to begin asking a series of questions, questions that emerged through the sit-in movement, through the free speech movement, through the antiwar movement. There are essentially five of them:

First of all, they said isn't it true that Government creates jobs better than free enterprise, and all of the Socialist professors said yes it is.

Second, they said isn't it true that high technology is more dangerous rather than beneficial. And the left said yes it is.

Third, they said isn't it true that you can't really allow those yokels to have power and we need centralized bureaucracies that are smart to protect us from all of those dumb local governments. The left said yes it is.

Fourth, they said isn't it true that traditional values are old-fashioned and that drugs and radical lifestyles really involve no risks. The left said that's exactly right.

Fifth, finally they asked isn't it true that the world is not dangerous, American leadership is just paranoid. The left said you're exactly right, the world is Epcot Center and the United States is a bully.

The fact is that on all five of the major questions asked by the baby boom generation the American left was fundamentally wrong. But the left was also very powerful for 15 years. And what happened? All of you lived through this and can measure it from your own memories.

By 1980, we had a President whose drug adviser was fired for illegally prescribing drugs. Remember Peter Bourne, people have forgotten him but he was Jimmy Carter's drug adviser. Why do I blame the left for the current drug crisis. Because when the Presidential adviser says "of course we're going to legalize heroin" and goes around illegally prescribing drugs, that helped create the mess we are in. The average young person watching the Carter administration's drug adviser had to be misled. After all, if the President's drug adviser does it, it can't be that bad.

Second, we had tried Government domination of enterprise and it had failed. By 1980, we were at 13 percent inflation, 22 percent interest rates. Do some of you remember these figures? We were heading into the worst unemployment crisis since the Great Depression. By 1980, the American dollar was disintegrating so fast that Italian hotels wouldn't take greenbacks—that was literally true.

Furthermore, our military capability collapsed. When Reagan used the U.S. Navy to send the warning to Qadhafi by bombing Libya, I made the comment that we could not have done that in 1980 because the Navy couldn't have found Libya but that was not bad because they didn't have any bombs anyway.

But remember 1980? American helicopters burning in the Iranian desert. The Soviet Army invading Afghanistan. Communists taking over Nicaragua, while we were told by the liberals

"they're not really Communists, they're just good guys who use the wrong code words."

What was the left's answer. It was the famous "Malaise speech." Remember the Carter attitude? We are all going to live in misery, but as a liberal he promised you it would be equal misery. And the left already had a plan for misery stamps.

If you think I exaggerate how bad it was, as a freshman in 1979, I helped fight against gasoline rationing. Remember the left's energy analysis? At \$5 a gallon for gasoline—they were only off by a factor of 10—working people will not be able to afford getting to work. Therefore the left said the only solution is to take power out of your pocketbook and put it in the bureaucrat and let them issue you gasoline stamps.

And if you think I exaggerate, I'll show you the debates in which the liberal Democrats said just that.

Now what happened? Luckily we live in a free society. The average American is not necessarily sophisticated but is reasonably wise—wise enough to buy cars, and buy houses, and find jobs, and drive to work without a wreck most mornings. The average American can do lots of things we don't think about when we get academics into a room to analyze popular opinion. In 1980, the average American said, "Let me understand. I have this unknown, untested guy from California and I have this known tested product that is destroying the country, how should I vote this fall?"

They decided that guaranteed failure was probably not a good idea.

Thus, in 1980 they elected a new team. And in a very shocking upset, they gave Republicans control of the U.S. Senate and they elected a guy who, I will say to you, no one thought would be as great a President as he is.

The truth is that Ronald Reagan now ranks as one of the two or three greatest Presidents in the 20th century with Franklin Roosevelt. He is an extraordinary figure.

The first time I sensed he was going to be extraordinary was the January 1981 day he was sworn in. Sitting up there on the Capitol steps for the inaugural. The Sun was beginning to shine. Word began to pass among us that the American hostages had left Iranian airspace literally while we were sitting there. And Reagan said one sentence that no one on the left could have said. And I'll repeat it to you and you tell me if it's not exactly right.

He said, and I quote: "We have every right to dream heroic dreams, after all we're Americans."

And nobody on the left could have said that because, in the first place, the idea of heroics is romantic and left wingers are no longer romantic, they're cynical. In the second place,

nobody on the left could have said that because to suggest that being American is special is nationalistic and chauvinistic and nobody on the left wants to be those things. And in the third place, it was optimistic and the left had given up optimism sometime around 1968.

Yet the country at the gut level reacted because it was what we've always been. It was what made us different. We're not different because we're white or black or yellow or brown. We're not different because we're men or women, or young or old. We're different because we grow up in a fantasy called the American dream.

We're different because we actually believe at some deep gut level that the world can be different, that we can transcend race, nationality, ethnic background, and we can reach out and together create a world that's exciting and dynamic that our children can have a bigger pie and a better hospital that it can all work.

The job is to roll up your sleeve and go to work and not just argue with each other.

And that's different than any other dream on the planet. And we had forgotten that for awhile. We had lost our way.

□ 1430

Ronald Reagan also poses a problem for our generation. Ronald Reagan saved America from the collapse of the liberal welfare state. He literally turned us around psychologically, economically, politically. And that is the most any one person can do for a country of 250 million people.

And to expect him to turn us around, pull us back from the brink, and create the nineties is more than is reasonable to expect of one man, even a giant.

What he has really done is bought time for our generation to get our act together. He has bought us a few years to look out there and see Japan, and Taiwan, and Korea, to look at Germany and to say to ourselves do we want to roll up our sleeves again, do we want to go back and compete or do we want to run and hide and decay like Great Britain?

It's a very real choice we face in the next decade. Let me give you one example: Last year in a test that was conducted, 75 percent of the Japanese scored higher in mathematics than the top 5 percent of Americans. We have a very simple choice in an emerging information industrial society. Either we clean up our process of education so that we're able to compete head to head or we quit the world market. No big complicated choice.

We're not going to stay in the game in the world market when 75 percent of their students are better prepared for the computer age than the top 5 percent of our children.

And you can go through study after study. The Japanese graduate 500 lawyers a year, we graduate 30,000. As the most litigious society on the planet, we're not going to be able to both sue our entrepreneurs and expect them to create jobs. We face a very serious choice, do we want to reform our litigious system or do we want to decay and hide from the world market?

We have doubled the share of our gross national product that goes to health care. We have also dramatically expanded the quality of life for people as we get older. But we better start thinking through how we're going to have dramatic reductions in the cost of health care with less bureaucracy and less red tape. I do not want cost containment I want improved product and less cost. That's the American tradition, something better for less that is what entrepreneurial capitalism and technology are all about.

And that's very different from the mess we're drifting into, which is an increasingly bureaucratized, increasingly socialized, increasingly redtaped medical system. So you take case after case and you can say to yourself, if you're honest about the future, we have to change. Now a lot of people will tell you that politicians should never talk about change. Change, they say, scares people, and it may if you're not Americans.

You know, the other great President of the 20th century, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a man who had had polio, who could stand only with braces and only with enormous effort, said in his first inaugural we have nothing to fear but fear itself. I think it is in that tradition that Ronald Reagan, who was at one time a Franklin Delano Roosevelt New Deal Democrat, that Ronald Reagan would have said that change is American; to continue to adapt to develop his America.

Let me tell you what I have been saying to older people, because they are statistically the people most afraid of change.

I have been asking people at the American Association of Retired Persons meetings, "How many of you have ever lived in a house that never had electricity?" In Cedartown, two-thirds of the people raised their hands. In Hapeville, one-third raised their hands. Now, think about that for just a moment. Right now today in Cedartown, GA, two-thirds of the folks I was talking with at one time in their life lived in a house without electricity. In one lifetime they went from no electricity to lights, refrigerators, freezers, microwave ovens, videotape recorders, cable television, electric toothbrushes, air-conditioning. In their lives they have experienced change, and they know that most of the time for most Americans change has been progress.

Now that we have agreed that change is American, let us talk about the next cycle of change.

Because none of us have to be afraid of change as long as we are rationally talking about it and we are controlling it. The only changes we have to fear are the changes that come out of the dark because our politicians don't have the guts to tell us about the future.

There have to be major areas of fundamental, discussable change, including health care, education, the welfare system, the process of retirement, mutual trade and the world market, the military, drugs, you can walk through them step by step.

Let me bring this back just for a moment to the whole notion that our history is a very simple one and one that I hope all Americans think about. We are a Nation made up of people who had the courage to cross the oceans when there were no airplanes or steamships. We are a nation made up of people whose ancestors underwent incredible privation for freedom. Some people have driven a greater distance today than would have been possible to move across by covered wagons in a month.

I used to teach the oldest men's class at First Baptist in Carrollton. One of the men in the 1920's followed an oxcart from Tennessee to Carrollton on a dirt road. As late as 1950, Georgia 166 from Carrollton to Atlanta was not paved. The world has changed remarkably in two generations. It can change remarkably in the future.

We need an agenda for America that lets our children and grandchildren have a chance to be free, to be prosperous, to be safe.

In closing, before I yield, let me just say I think the central issue for 1986 is simple: raising taxes to prop up the welfare state keeps us tied to the past. Raising taxes lets the Democrats, who have dominated the House since 1954, avoid the serious changes in the Government they created.

I can appreciate with a Speaker who was first elected to public office in 1936, whose career was devoted to building the liberal welfare state it is hard to change. I can understand why next year with a new Speaker who will have been first elected to office, I believe in 1948, who spent his career building a liberal welfare state it is difficult to change. But the thing the American public should demand is that the election on Election Day 1986 is a choice between the future and the past, it is a choice between taking a no-tax-increase pledge to force the Government to change or those people who want to prop up the past by raising taxes and taking money out of the pocket of the American people.

I would be glad to yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. First of all, I want to thank you for yielding. I do consid-

er you my friend even though we are on opposite sides of the aisle but our names are right next to each other on the board. So whenever I look for the name Glickman to vote, I see the name Gingrich right above me. Even though we sometimes do not vote the same way, I am sure we have the same goals in mind, which is a prosperous and healthy America.

It is just that as I was listening to the gentleman and that while there are some things I can agree with, I must agree with his characterization in one respect where the gentleman made a statement that he said it demonstrated a degree of hyperbole. I must tell the gentleman I felt there was a remarkable, rather substantial amount of hyperbole in his statement. It reminded me of the old H.L. Mencken quote, "for every complicated problem there is a simple and a wrong solution." The gentleman has the interesting way of characterizing all of America's problems as somehow dealing with the "liberal Democratic welfare state." In effect, when you go down and look at the way people vote on the floor of this House, there is a demonstrable lack of difference on major votes between Republican and Democrats. In fact, when you look at where most Members of Congress are on issues and where most members of the public are on issues, there is a demonstrable place in the middle of the political spectrum with respect to almost all Americans and most people in this particular Chamber that we serve in. As a matter of fact, most people are pretty pragmatic. That is the great nature of America as we are willing to look and experiment for change.

I just noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself, the gentleman is talking about no taxes. I noticed the gentleman voted for the Superfund bill; so did I. That raises \$8.5 billion worth of taxes. But we know that we had to raise those revenues in some capacity to clean up toxic wastes in America so that folks would not be exposed to carcinogenic wastes and other toxic wastes. Nobody wanted to do that but we knew, and the gentleman must have known, because he and I voted the same way on this bill, to clean up toxic wastes in America. I guess my point is I respect what the gentleman is saying, but I think there is a lot of empty air in what he is saying. He knows as well as I do this is a complicated country with a lot of complicated problems. Most Americans have gravitated toward the center, toward the responsible middle in dealing with these problems; both Democrats and Republicans are. Most people want a government that pretty much leaves them alone but do want to be protected against bigness, against antitrust violations. They want to have a remarkable amount of service in terms

of electricity, power, water, transportation, those kinds of things. So I guess my closing point, and then I am sure the gentleman will want to respond, is that his remarks are interesting, but I do not think they have very much substance to them.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me comment for a second because I am fascinated by the way you managed to frame this. In the first place, as I mentioned in my remarks, 58 percent of the America people in the average Presidential election from 1968 to the present voted against the Democratic nominee. Now, 58 percent is a reasonably big margin. That is literally true. Fifty-eight percent on the average, not the landslide, on the average voted against the Democratic nominee if you take 1968, 1972, 1976, 1980, and 1984 and you combine them.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I might characterize it differently, 58 percent voted for the Republican nominee.

Mr. GINGRICH. It does not work out that way because of the Wallace vote and the Anderson vote.

The point I am making which I think is fundamental, and I guess I take exception to what the gentleman said: if you take all the spending bills in this House in the course of 2 years, take the National Taxpayers Union rating, for example, for this year, which is rated now, unlike the past, by volume, by scale; the top 10 percent of big spenders, every single one of them is a Democrat; the bottom 10 percent, every single one of them, the least spenders, are Republicans. There is just no question that is true.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Well, first of all, I would argue with the characterization of the gentleman. I have lived here for 10 years, and I see that the old reference to Everett Dirksen, I once heard a story about him when he was in the Senate, the Senate majority leader—minority leader at that time, and he was putting some money in the water bill, and his colleague, Paul Douglas, said to him, "Everett, I thought you were a conservative, I thought you did not like to add Federal spending. I thought you were a man of principle." Everett responded, "I am a man of principle but my first principle is flexibility."

The fact of the matter is that is true regardless of whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, and I do not like to see anybody hide behind labels whether they are extraneous labels to their party or to themselves, because the fact of the matter is, if I may just finish and go on, no matter how you characterize how Members vote, for the most part Members vote what is best for their districts, for their States, and for their country. That is what we are elected to do up here. I just think the gentleman's characterization about—a certain characteriza-

tion of people on one side and certain on the other side is just not true, totally.

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman would not accept as a generalization in the legitimate sense—maybe because I was a college teacher although I was a history teacher and not a political scientist—but the gentleman would not accept as a generalization that it is fair to say that the Democratic Party is likely to have more people favorable to the liberal welfare state than the Republican Party.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I would not because I do not know what the liberal welfare state means in the way you define it.

Mr. GINGRICH. I will give you an example out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I got up on the floor this year and I offered the amendment to put into the bill the Reagan Workfare Program. There were 183 vote for that amendment, most of them Republican, a few conservative Democrats. There were 220-some votes against that amendment; overwhelmingly they were Democrats.

I would say it is a fair characterization to say that on that day in this House that Republicans were collectively mostly willing to vote for workfare, Democrats collectively were mostly willing to vote against workfare.

Mr. GLICKMAN. OK, now if we may examine that, because in the Agriculture Committee I am working on the workfare concept.

If you look at the Reagan Workfare Program, it offers virtually no flexibility for the States, offers them a great financial disadvantage in getting the program started. But if the gentleman is saying there are certain Members who reject workfare just from a knee-jerk reaction, there may be, and they are wrong, they are wrong.

Mr. GINGRICH. And they tend to be Democrats.

Mr. GLICKMAN. That I will not agree with. I am saying the question you have to define is, Can you demonstrate we can devise as good programs that work?

Mr. GINGRICH. Now, wait, I just have to go on with this because I am fascinated. The gentleman would not agree that, if we did a content analysis of the debate in the last 4 years, that overwhelmingly the largest number of people who ideologically rejected workfare would happen to be Democrats.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I cannot agree with that because I have not seen the statistics. I think it misses the point. I think the point is that we should be working toward reaching a consensus on the issues.

Mr. GINGRICH. But we disagree.

Mr. GLICKMAN. The gentleman's methodology is to polarize.

Mr. GINGRICH. Wait a second. Let me give you one more example. Your nominee for President in 1984.

Mr. GLICKMAN. You mean the Democratic Party nominee.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, you are a Democrat, and I assume you voted for Mondale.

Mr. GLICKMAN. All right.

Mr. GINGRICH. I know you do not like labels, but you are a Democratic Member of the House.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I accept my nominee, but the way you characterize it, it was like my brother, my sister, my father. He was my nominee for President.

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman makes a good point. The nominee of the Democratic Party, 1984, said, fair enough, that in his judgment, and I paraphrase him, he wanted to be honest, taxes have to go up; and he will tell you right now he will do it, and the only difference is Reagan will not tell you but he is going to do it, too.

Now, a number of us on my side of the aisle, and I served on the Republican National Platform Committee that year, a number of us, the gentleman is correct, literally decided to force a choice. We said, "no"; we said as bad as the deficit is, the deficit is not as bad as a massive tax increase, and there is a difference, I think the gentleman will concede, between those funds necessary, about \$1.5 billion a year to take care of a public health problem like toxic waste, and a \$60 billion tax increase like a colleague of yours was suggesting.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Wait a second now. Did you sign the no-tax-increase pledge?

Mr. GINGRICH. Which is very specific. It says no tax increase on 15- and 28-percent individual rates and no tax increase on the 34-percent corporate rate.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Your colleague from New York, Mr. KEMP, in voting against the Superfund bill indicated the reason why he did that is because he had signed the no-tax-increase pledge.

Mr. GINGRICH. He takes the pledge. The pledge itself is to the rates in the new reform bill.

Mr. GLICKMAN. So it is a very specific pledge.

Mr. GINGRICH. Very specific. Frankly designed over the next 10 years to freeze rates and create a national understanding that you do not raise those rates.

□ 1445

Mr. GLICKMAN. So the gentleman does not view raising taxes other than income taxes to be subject to your pledge.

Mr. GINGRICH. I happen, for example, to favor user fees. I think there are a lot of things we should consider.

Let me carry it back for a second, because I think the gentleman's points are legitimate.

I think the country ought to choose between fundamentally changing the welfare state of fundamentally paying for it. I agree with half of George Wells' argument. Walter Mondale came forward, legitimately, and said, hey, I am a liberal welfare state Democrat, I believe in government, I want more money. We campaigned on the grounds that you ought to have a whole series of reforms, and the work fair plan was one of them, and you should not raise taxes. That is not a consensus issue. That is a fundamental confrontation between a liberal welfare state approach and an opportunity society approach that are different. I mean there is not a compromise ground in the middle. There may be compromises to get to the ultimate destination, but there are really two very different destinations.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I might say to my colleague from Georgia that I venture to say that if we sat down and we discussed issues on a program-by-program basis, whether it has to do with regulation of banks or transportation or other kinds of things, there would not be very much difference between us.

But I guess what I object to is this incredibly extremist rhetoric on the gentleman's part where you characterize and define somebody called liberal welfare state, which, of course, has a pejorative title; then the gentleman characterize opportunity society which has this most incredible fairy tale title.

Mr. GINGRICH. But in the 1950's, liberal welfare state was an academic term, it was not pejorative.

Mr. GLICKMAN. We do not live in the 1950's, and the gentleman knows that that does not exist right now.

Mr. GINGRICH. It has become a pejorative because we have gotten to know it. But in fact it originally was a set of ideas that said let us raise taxes, create a bureaucracy and it will deliver government.

Mr. GLICKMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I really think the fact of the matter is, I go back to this point, that this kind of argument, while I suppose it is interesting for politicians to talk about, does not necessarily do the people any good, people who are facing bank foreclosures because of farm problems, people are facing lack of air service, rail service because of transportation problems in America, the kinds of things that affect average folk in this country. When they need government help, they could really care less whether you are called a liberal welfare state person or an opportunity society person. They want government that helps then take care of themselves and protect them from big,

bad, greedy businesses, big, bad, greedy government.

I have this feeling by talking in the kind of hyperbolic terms we are talking about today, we do not get any closer to reaching solutions to the kinds of problems that average folks face at home.

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman's party created a great national majority that has lasted a long time, because you had a President who talked about the New Deal. He said we are going to create a whole series of interesting ideas and interesting new programs. I am confident there were Republicans in that generation who got up and said, "What does the New Deal mean?" But every American had sort of a gut instinct that Franklin Roosevelt had a direction of an activist government. It is legitimate for politicians to talk in symbolic language to create a frame of thoughts.

Let me go back to the point the gentleman just made. Frankly, I have to say that not only are our names close together up there, but the gentleman from Kansas represents a more moderate Democrat than the majority which controls his caucus. The fact is parties do tend to have sort of centers of gravity. The center of gravity of the House Democratic Party is today on the left. It is on the left on foreign policy. It is on the left on taxes. The gentleman's caucus would vote for a tax increase in the morning. They would come back for a special session on Monday if they thought Reagan would sign it.

Mr. GLICKMAN. That is, of course, why the Speaker of the House has brought a tax increase down to this floor in the last 4 years.

Mr. GINGRICH. Reagan has said he will veto it.

Five leading Democrats in the House have said we ought to have a tax increase.

Mr. GLICKMAN. That is like the ads I see on TV that five doctors on a desert island say that they would prefer Anacin over aspirin. It is an irrelevant statistic.

Mr. GINGRICH. We are talking about the Speaker, the majority leader, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the head of the conference and a senior member of the Budget Committee. These are not random back-bench Democrats we picked off in the corner and got drunk. These are very serious leaders of the National Democratic Party. And I do not disagree with them from their value system. If you believe in a liberal welfare state, you ought to pay for it.

Mr. GLICKMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think that is any way believing the liberal welfare state. That is being a prudent, responsible, balanced person, whether in business, whatever government you have, you ought to pay for it.

Mr. GINGRICH. My point, as I said earlier, maybe before the gentleman came to the floor, is in 5 consecutive elections, 58 percent of the people have voted, on the average, have voted against the Presidential candidate of bigger government. I think that is a fair summarization.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I do not accept that characterization. During the same period of time, a majority of votes have been cast for Democrats in congressional and senatorial races.

Mr. GINGRICH. I also made the point in this House, maybe before the gentleman got here, that there are two big factors to that. One of them is the enormous incumbency advantage that the class of 1974 created as soon as it got here. As the gentleman knows, it is incredibly hard to beat an incumbent who does not get real sloppy; I mean just the weight of paid staff, direct mail; second, gerrymandering which, in balance, marginally helps your party; and third, an issue which came up last week, which is in some States and in some districts, people have voted who are dead. I mean in close races in Indiana in the seat where the gentleman was seated, they have now indicted enough officials involved in enough votes that it is clear the Democrat could have won.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Wait a second. The gentleman is speaking in Orwellian language now. I do not countenance vote fraud wherever it occurs in this country. The gentleman cannot paint that with a brush on either political party in this country.

Mr. GINGRICH. Oh, come on.

Mr. GLICKMAN. It is ridiculous.

Mr. GINGRICH. It is not ridiculous.

Mr. GLICKMAN. It is ridiculous.

But I guess we could get into a—

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me ask you because I am quite serious, this is at a good government level, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, who controls, most of the big city machines?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I do not know the answer to the question, because there are a lot of Republican mayors being elected around this country.

The point is most public officials are honest. Most State officials are honest around the country, period.

Mr. GINGRICH. But it was estimated, for example, in Illinois in 1982 by the U.S. attorney that 100,000 votes were cast by people who do not exist.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I have not seen the report.

Let me go back to just one thing, because I am going to have to run. I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

I guess my point in all this is go back to the situation that we have a lot of problems in America, problems that affect average people, problems of trade deficits, banking, transportation and opportunity in the future. I do not

want my party to be the party of the status quo and not accept change. I think that is wrong, and I do not think you could find very many people in my party who want to pursue that mode.

But the fact of the matter is the American people do not want to hear blame. They figure there is enough blame and historical hyperbole to go around 100 times over. They want a country that moves forward, and they want solutions to their problems.

I hope that the dialog produces that kind of result, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. GINGRICH. I was glad to yield.

I just want to say that I hope next week to bring to the floor 30 or 40 specific proposals for change that have been killed in the subcommittee or committee by the Democratic Party in the House, each of which were to save money.

My only point is to make the case that the Reagan administration and the new ideas Republicans who really think opportunity society really is more than hyperbole really have been trying to move forward a whole wave of change. And it is very, very difficult to get it through in a Democratic House that has been dominated, as I said, by a Speaker who was first elected to office in 1936 and a majority leader who was first elected to office in 1948, and whose natural instincts are to protect the liberal welfare state they created.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Towns].

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I came over because the gentleman mentioned on several occasions user fees. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. When the gentleman talks about raising taxes and you say you are against raising taxes, but I think I hear the gentleman say that he would be for user fees.

If the gentleman is for user fees, does not the gentleman think that hurts the people who really need the help, the poor farmers around this country who are reaching out and asking for help in almost every way possible. If we come up with user fees, we are really hurting the folks who we should try to help.

□ 1455

Mr. GINGRICH. I appreciate very much the gentleman's intervention. Let me give you an example of the user fee that is totally appropriate.

That is whether or not the Coast Guard should be reimbursed when it tows in some clown whose yacht ran out of fuel because he did not check before he left the port. Now we have had a system where the Coast Guard will go out and free of charge will tow you in, frankly, for public safety reasons, we do not want you to drown be-

cause you are stupid, but I would ask you the question: If a man can afford a pretty fancy motor yacht and he is 25 miles offshore and because he either was not paying attention or he got a little sloppy or something he has to get towed in, is it really fair for people in your district, most of whom, I suspect, do not own yachts, is it fair for them to have to pay through General Treasury so the Coast Guard is available to go get that guy's yacht, or should we charge a user fee to that guy and say you are going to pay your share of the cost of the Coast Guard coming out here to get you?

Mr. TOWNS. If the gentleman will yield, but what does that really do when you look at the total deficit? When you look at the problems that farmers are having in this country today, what does that really do?

Mr. GINGRICH. You have raised, I think, the central question here. My impression is, and in my own life my experience has been that when a family gets in trouble financially that in fact nickels and dimes do add up. You do learn to be a lot more careful. That if we save, let us say, I am guessing, \$70 million, almost nothing by the standards of Washington, but a lot for people in your district, \$70 million on that user fee. If we find other appropriate user fees, and user fees by themselves are not going to solve the whole problem. But they are going to raise, the administration proposed, collectively \$4.5 or \$5 billion. A billion; now billions are moderately big. Five billion dollars is a step in the right direction.

Now, the other thing I would like to see us do, frankly, is rethink from the ground up, virtually the entire Government. Before I want to ask a single family in your district to pinch pennies in their family budget because we raise their taxes, I want to pinch pennies in this city, in this Government.

I will give you an example which normally you would expect to come more from a liberal Democrat. I think procurement in the Pentagon is ridiculous. I think it is crazy the way we procure goods. I think it is crazy. I am not going to go out here and say to your family or your neighborhood, "I am going to raise taxes \$750 because we cannot find guys smart enough to buy a \$50 toilet seat, so they are buying \$800 toilet seats." I am just not going to do it.

Mr. TOWNS. I can understand that and I will agree with you. I think the thing that disturbs me deeply is that when we talk about user fees we generally talk about the driver's license, the marriage license, we talk about boats or yachts or anything of that nature. We talk about the things that really hurt people that are barely making it.

Mr. GINGRICH. Were you in the State legislature? Because the two you

mention, driver's licenses and marriage licenses would be at the State level and I frankly have never studied that; I think you have made a good point.

Mr. TOWNS. The point I am making is that we set the tone and if we begin to behave that way here, what will happen in terms of local governments; that is the thing I am talking about. I think that we need to face up to some real issues here. That we have tremendous deficit; how do we close it?

You know as well as I do that the only way to close is to look for revenue. We cannot cut our way out of this mess.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me ask you something because I really appreciate your coming over and discussing this with me. Are you really prepared to go back home to your district and say to people who are working hard and who work really for take-home pay, they do not work for gross income; they work for the money left on Friday after the Government takes the taxes.

Are you prepared to say to them that in your best judgment we in the Congress have done a good enough job at squeezing waste out of Government and rethinking Government and that we are going to use their pennies wisely? Do you not down deep have to go back home and say, "Look, we do not have the Pentagon really trimmed up, we do not have health care really debureaucratized, we have not really solved these other problems, but I am going to raise taxes anyway because, frankly, it is just too big a job and I cannot get waste out of Washington so I am going to make you get waste out of your family budget."

Does this not sort of bother you that we waste as much money as we do in this city and you would suggest raising taxes?

Mr. TOWNS. The point is that when you talk about waste, that is a separate issue. You know as well as I do that one of the areas that we have a lot of waste in is the defense budget. You know as well as I do. I have looked at it from day one and I continue to say that, that we need to begin to look at some reform and to do some things in some areas that could be cut.

In the meantime, while we are not thinking about that, what are we going to do for poor people in this country that cannot make it? That, as we approach the winter there are people that cannot afford to buy oil. Do we not have an obligation and responsibility in Government to reach and to provide services for those people?

We have people who are homeless in this country that have no way of getting a home. At the same time, we are cutting money out of HUD. I just do not understand our thinking. You seem to be a person that, every now and then, you show great compassion

and I am always excited when that happens, but when you look at what is happening in the direction that we are moving in, I think it would have to disturb you as well as it disturbs me.

Mr. GINGRICH. It does. I appreciate the "every now and then," but let me ask you a question. I assume you were talking about heating oil which, as a Georgian, we frankly do not buy a whole lot of it, but is it not fair to say that, from the standpoint of the poor, dropping the price of gasoline from about \$1.20 a gallon—in my area right now it is about 60 cents a gallon—that that helped the average poor person, of course, not in New York City where they tend to take the subway more than the car, but the comparable drop in heating oil price, that in fact ending inflation or bringing it down to 2 percent a year, bringing interest rates down from 22 percent to where we have TV ads right now for 2.9 percent financing for cars. Do not those things in the general economy help tremendously for that poor person who is out there who has barely enough money to go to work and now they are only paying 59 or 60 cents a gallon where they were paying \$1.20 a gallon under Jimmy Carter. Does that not make a big difference?

Mr. TOWNS. I agree that makes a big difference, but I think the point I really want to make and the point that I came to the floor to make is that as we look at our plans and as you continue to ask people to sign up, do not lose sight of those people who are unemployed, those people who are underemployed, those people who can barely make it because of the lack of income.

When you get people to sign the pledge, ask them to please think about those folks in the process.

Mr. GINGRICH. Before you leave, I want to ask you about one other thing because you have touched on something that really bothers me, and I want to talk about this for a second.

One of the reasons I am so strongly in favor of a no tax increase pledge is that I have seen the record now for the last 46 months where we have created something like 12 million new jobs. We have not done all we should, we certainly have problems in agriculture, we have problems in oil, but it is true that in the last 46 months we have created 12 million new jobs. That has helped everybody; black, white, yellow, brown; we are a little better off.

I guess part of what I mean by an opportunity society is the, what I think is a fact, that private entrepreneurs are more likely to create jobs in Brooklyn or Queens or the Bronx or Manhattan than the Government is. That if we can keep tax rates at 34 percent for corporations and 28 and 15 for individuals, we liberate the energy

and the drive and the creativity of all of those rising young people who want to get out there and invent a job and create a factory and do the things that employ the very people that you describe.

You watch France for a second, and the French tried socialism under Mitterrand in 1981, 1982, and 1983 and it failed so badly they are now trying Reaganomics. You look at Hong Kong and Taiwan and Singapore and South Korea and Japan and you see this surge of new jobs.

I guess all I would ask my good friend is, and I do not want to put you on the spot but, is it not fair to say that for a poor black living in the central city, if we could have an explosion with enterprise zones and with lower rates and with new money available and new drive and entrepreneurship, that is more likely in the next decade to create the real job that they keep for a lifetime than another Government program.

Mr. TOWNS. But it will not happen unless there is some incentive, and that is the thing that bothers me. If you do not have any incentives, business is not going to come into major urban areas to create any job. I think we are kidding ourselves if we think they are going to do so. When you eliminate the kind of special incentives for them to do it, they are not coming.

Let me just say this in closing. As you continue to encourage people to sign your pledge, do not forget as you do that to think about the people that are homeless, the people that have no jobs, the people that are starving in the United States of America. When you show me that you are committed to that cause, I will sign your pledge, too.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think that is fair and frankly that is one reason that I wish we could have passed enterprise zone bills this year to create the incentive in the inner city to create the jobs.

I just want to say in closing, and I hope this dialog has been helpful to my colleagues.

I really do think the choice in 1986 is between the past and future. It is between propping up a liberal welfare state that was created in the 1960's and 1970's or moving forward to an opportunity society. It is between raising taxes to pay for the Government of the past or refusing to raise taxes and forcing the politicians in Washington to rethink the welfare state, to move toward workfare, toward privatization, toward less bureaucracy and less red-tape, and toward a system that I think is vital because our generation has to make use of the time Ronald Reagan has bought us.

We are faced in the 1990's with a very severe challenge of competing economically with West Germany and Japan; competing military with the

Soviet Union. If we are going to be competitive again, we have to rethink a great deal the way we do business. We have to have much better education, much better health care, a much more efficient and effective government, and we are going to have to get the job done.

If we raise taxes, we take the pressure off of the liberal welfare state politicians and let them avoid that difficult, complex process.

□ 1505

If we refuse to raise taxes, we then send the signal to Washington, go out and find a new idea, go out and find the new approaches, get the system to work so you can live within a trillion dollar budget because, frankly, a trillion dollars is enough. We ought to be able to get the job done for a trillion dollars if we will get smart and roll up our sleeves and reform the system until it works.

COLA'S

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable controversy between the various groups of Federal employees, Federal retirees, and military retirees, concerning the inequity and unfairness of the manner in which the Federal Government treats cost of living increases [COLA's].

For instance, Federal employees complain that their pensions are taxable, yet Social Security benefits are in large part tax free.

In addition, it has been pointed out by many Federal and military retirees that they are being discriminated against in having their COLA's denied because some 37 million Social Security recipients expect to receive a COLA in 1987, which will cost at least \$2 billion.

I completely agree. Fairness and equity are important and are not being practiced in this instance. No COLA's, in my opinion, should be given to any group during times of national financial trauma.

For 1987, the budget assumes with the President's blessing, a 1 to 1.3 percent COLA for all Social Security recipients, but the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation could preclude military retirees and civil service retirees from receiving a COLA again for the second time in 2 years.

These groups complain about the unfairness, the inequity, and uncertainty of this treatment, and I agree that the Government is simply not being fair.

I will point out later in my presentation a glaring inequity between the pay of Federal employees and COLA's of Federal retirees.

Take the case of two Federal employees in late 1969.

No. 1 retires at an annual benefit of \$10,000.

No. 2 begins a job at an annual salary of \$10,000.

Seventeen years later in 1986, No. 1 has a Federal retirement of \$29,700 because of COLA increases.

No. 2 has a salary of \$23,000 at his Federal job, \$6,700 less than his retired colleague. No. 1 is making more in retirement than No. 2 is working.

I don't want to demean Federal retirees in any fashion, in fact I salute them for their past service to America. I have fought to maintain their 3-year basis recovery rule in the tax bill and I will continue to work for them.

It is also my impression that the Federal retirees to their credit are willing to forgo the COLA's during deficit years on two conditions.

Those conditions are,

First, that all retirees, including social security recipients, forgo them, in a fair and equal manner.

Second, that the cuts are meaningful and that they directly contribute to a decrease in the deficit.

There is an area in which Federal employees are definitely being discriminated against. As I have pointed out, they have not received the same percentage increase that retirees have through the years. That doesn't make sense to me, since Federal employees who are working today are buying homes, educating children, paying Federal income taxes, and paying into the current retirement fund.

This, of course, means that when the 7-percent retirement deduction is taken from a civil servant's check each month, it is sent indirectly to a retiree. If Federal workers stop paying into the retirement fund, more dollars would have to be allocated from general revenues to meet the Government's obligation to pay benefits as required by law.

Let me astound you with a tale of percentage increases during the years 1969 to 1986, provided by the Congressional Research Service.

The Consumer Price Index, which we use to measure how much we pay for the items that we need to live, increased by 193 percent during these 17 years.

The Federal civil service pay has lagged behind at 133 percent.

Federal and military retiree benefits with COLA's have increased by 197 percent.

The private sector average wages have increased by 193 percent.

Social Security benefits, because of general benefit increases and COLA's, have increased by 260 percent, far in excess of the rise in the cost of living over that period.

In order for me to better explain the effects that COLA's have on the

budget and to the recipients, I want to display the following charts, with facts provided by the Congressional Research Service.

Let me draw some examples for you based on that information:

Looking at chart 1 you will note that a 30-year civil service retiree who retired at 55 with a base retirement benefit of \$10,000 in late 1969 would be drawing an income of \$29,700 in 1986—an increase of 197 percent.

The same retiree with a base retirement of \$20,000, 53 percent of a \$38,000 salary, would now have a retirement income of \$59,400, an increase of 197 percent.

CHART 1.—CONGRESSMAN RICHARD RAY AGGREGATE INCREASE IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREES BENEFITS

Annual benefits Dec. 1969	Annual benefits 1986	Percentage increase
\$10,000	\$29,700	197
\$20,000	\$59,400	197

Turning to chart 2, a military retiree who retired in 1970 and whose first annual retirement benefit payment was \$10,000 would now be receiving \$29,700.

A military retiree at \$25,000 would receive \$79,400, an amount higher than the highest paid general schedule employee, which is \$68,700. This represents an almost 200-percent increase in 16 years.

Civil Service and military retirees were authorized automatic COLA's in 1962 and 1963 respectively. Social Security recipients have received periodic increases since 1950. However, in 1972 the Congress guaranteed annual COLA's to Social Security recipients beginning in 1975 if the 3 percent CPI trigger were cleared.

CHART 2.—CONGRESSMAN RICHARD RAY AGGREGATE INCREASE IN MILITARY RETIREES BENEFITS

Annual benefits Dec. 1969	Annual benefits 1986	Percentage increase
\$10,000	\$29,700	197
\$25,000	\$79,400	197

Flipping now to chart 3, it shows that over the last 17 years, Social Security benefits have increased over 260 percent because of COLA's and increases. In the years 1970-72 Social Security recipients received an increase in their benefits of over 50 percent.

The average Social Security recipient who retired in late 1969 with a base benefit of \$1,000 would now be receiving \$3,600. A retired couple receiving \$2,500 in 1969 would now be receiving \$9,000.

CHART 3.—CONGRESSMAN RICHARD RAY—AGGREGATE INCREASE IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREES BENEFITS

Annual benefits Dec. 1969	Annual benefits 1985	Percentage increase
\$1,000	\$3,600	262
\$2,500	\$9,000	262

Turning to the final chart you will note that there is a bigger difference between retirees and current employees with regard to the comparison of their salaries and benefits. While the CPI has gone up 193 percent and Federal retirees benefits have increased 197 percent, Federal civil service pay has lagged behind with only 133 percent increase over the same 15 years. For example, a civil servant, who retired December 31, 1969 making \$10,000, would currently be receiving \$23,000. Another Federal employee earning \$20,000 would now be earning \$46,700.

CHART 4.—CONGRESSMAN RICHARD RAY—AGGREGATE INCREASE IN CIVIL SERVICE PAY

Annual salary Dec. 1969	Annual salary 1986	Percentage increase
\$10,000	\$23,000	133
\$20,000	\$46,700	133

I am frequently criticized for not supporting cost of living increases.

My reason being the treacherous national debt and the philosophy that it's all right to continue spending \$5 for every \$4 of income, which has driven America into the category of a debtor nation.

It's my impression that the general public, including retirees, doesn't understand how generous the Federal retirement programs are and how costly they are.

I can understand why the Federal and military retirees get up-in-arms when COLA's are delayed. COLA's are contributing significantly to their retirement income and they add up to "megabuck" expenses for the taxpayers, who, by the way, are also beginning to grumble about the cost.

It's obvious that a cap on COLA's must take place. I would urge the leaders and members of Federal retiree organizations to take the initiative in this respect, before the goose that laid the golden egg is killed by the debt and the deficit.

I am seriously concerned that the financial stability of America is in such jeopardy that many basic programs, including basic pensions, could be in danger. To fund COLA's in the financial deficit atmosphere of the 1987 budget may be politically feasible but it is not sound policy.

In some cases, farmers, textile workers, housewives, small business people and others who have retired, many involuntarily have no retirement pen-

sions. Some 100,000 farmers may have to leave their livelihoods in 1987 with only limited unemployment benefits, if even that.

We are all familiar with the plight of textile workers of which over 400,000 have been laid off, many with meager benefits, the majority with none.

The Social Security law currently does not allow for a COLA when inflation—as mirrored in the Consumer Price Index—does not rise above 3 percent.

The budget committees and the legislative bodies are sensitive to election year politics and have included veterans benefits, railroad retirees, civil service retirees, veterans compensation and other retirement programs which all add up to more than \$5 billion if paid at the expected increase.

This is done at the same time that Gramm-Rudman-Hollings seeks to balance the budget by 1991 and mandates that Federal borrowing cannot exceed \$144 billion for 1987.

Cost of living adjustments, along with other fringe benefit expenses, should be constrained, if funding them will cause the basic pensions and other programs such as education, health care, and essential quality of life programs to be endangered.

With or without Gramm-Rudman, increases or cuts or perhaps both will be necessary between 1986 and 1991 to bring the country's spending into balance with its income.

If Gramm-Rudman is successful, it will be nothing short of a miracle and if so the big job will begin in 1991, when we should focus on and begin reducing the \$2 trillion debt, which we have a moral responsibility to face up to.

It's my opinion that America is at a crossroads from which there might be no return. Thus, we as Americans have an opportunity and a responsibility, at this time, to make Gramm-Rudman or a program of fiscal responsibility work.

It's not the best statute and we could have passed better legislation, but it is the only law in existence which forces this country to focus on the fiscal responsibility which has built America and which is imperative if we are going to save America as we know it.

The Congress has finally passed a budget—meeting the 1987 Gramm-Rudman spending levels, but I'm discouraged that we failed to make hard spending cuts to meet the levels and, instead, used a smoke-and-mirror process to project spending reductions which may not happen. A national magazine last week called the budget—Government by Gimmick!

For too many years, America has been over-generous, and indeed wasteful, to the point of using up the re-

sources of the future and obligating the incomes of not only the present generation but for the millions of yet unborn children and grandchildren who deserve as much opportunity as we do in this wonderful land. Instead they must shoulder the debt that we have incurred.

While I believe, as I have previously said, that to pay annual COLA's during deficit years is a bankrupting program, if we are going to do so, working Federal employees should be given a higher priority and percentage than retirees. Again, they are buying their homes, educating their children and paying into the retirement fund

so retirees can draw their higher basic pensions.

Quoting from an article by Bruce Bartlett of the Heritage Foundation on April 16, 1986,

Legislation designed to hold the elderly harmless from inflation actually gave them an enviable inflation bonus. At the same time, however, the real wages of working people, whose taxes pay for Social Security benefits, were falling.

Average weekly earnings, adjusted for inflation, tumbled from \$145 in 1973 to \$125 in 1984, while average monthly Social Security benefits climbed from \$166 to \$197 in the same period.

For example: Average weekly earnings fell to \$139 in 1974, \$135 in 1979, \$124 in 1981, and \$125 in 1983. Meanwhile, average Social

Security benefits rose to \$170 in 1974, \$181 in 1979, \$188 in 1981, and \$197 in 1983.

So, I would prefer that we simply postpone all automatic increases until the country is operating within its income and without a deficit.

I urge all Americans to join me in this effort in these dire financial straits. We simply cannot do business as usual, but instead must make sacrifices.

We must all do our share to remove from our country the unwelcome title of the largest debtor nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the following chart into the RECORD, to which I referred earlier.

INCREASES IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS, FEDERAL CIVILIAN AND MILITARY RETIREMENT, MILITARY PAY, FEDERAL PAY, VETERANS COMPENSATION, AVERAGE WAGES, AND THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

Year	Social security			Federal/civilian military retire			Federal pay			Military pay ¹		
	Month	Percent	Amount	Month	Percent	Amount	Month	Percent	Amount	Month	Percent	Amount
1970	January	15.0	100.00	August	5.6	100.00	January	6.0	100.00	January	6.6	100.00
1971	January	10.0	115.00	June	4.5	105.60	January	6.0	106.00	January	6.8	106.60
			126.50			110.35			112.36	November	14.2	130.02
1972	September	20.0	151.80	July	4.8	115.65	January	5.5	118.54	January	5.4	127.04
1973				July	6.1	122.70	January	5.1	124.59	January	6.0	145.20
							October	4.8	130.57	October	7.3	155.86
1974	June	11.0	168.50	January	5.5	129.45	October	5.5	137.75	October	5.5	164.43
				July	6.3	137.61						
1975	June	8.0	181.98	January	7.3	147.65	October	5.0	144.63	October	5.0	172.66
				August	5.1	155.18						
1976	June	6.4	193.62	March	5.4	163.56	October	4.8	151.58	October	4.8	180.94
1977	June	5.9	205.05	March	4.8	171.41	October	7.0	162.19	October	7.1	193.79
				September	4.3	178.79						
1978	June	6.5	218.38	March	2.4	183.08	October	5.5	171.11	October	5.5	204.45
				September	4.9	192.05						
1979	June	9.9	240.00	March	3.9	199.54	October	7.0	183.08	October	7.0	218.76
				September	6.9	213.30						
1980	June	14.3	274.32	March	6.0	226.10	October	9.1	199.78	September	0.9	220.73
				September	7.7	243.51				October	11.7	246.56
1981	June	11.2	305.04	March	4.4	254.23	October	4.8	209.37	October	14.3	281.81
1982	June	7.4	327.61	March	8.7	276.34	October	4.0	217.75			
1983	December	3.5	339.08	April	3.9	287.12				January	4.0	293.08
1984	December	3.5	350.95	December	3.5	297.17	January	3.5	225.37	January	4.0	304.81
1985	December	3.1	361.82	December	0.0	297.17	January	3.5	233.25	January	4.0	317.00
1986							January	0.0	233.25	October	3.0	326.51

¹ Weighted average increase in basic pay, basic allowance for quarters, and basic allowance for subsistence.

INCREASES IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS, FEDERAL CIVILIAN AND MILITARY RETIREMENT, MILITARY PAY, FEDERAL PAY, VETERANS COMPENSATION, AVERAGE WAGES, AND THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

Year	Veterans comp			Average wages ¹			Consumer price index-w ²			Pay for members of Congress		
	Month	Percent	Amount	Month	Percent	Amount	Month	Percent	Amount	Month	Percent	Amount
1970	July	10.0	100.00	July	6.6	106.62	July	5.9	105.90			100.00
1971			110.00	July	7.2	114.24	July	4.4	110.53			
1972	August	10.0	121.00	July	6.1	121.20	July	3.0	113.88			
1973				July	6.3	128.83	July	5.7	120.42			
1974	May	17.2	141.81	July	8.0	139.13	July	11.5	134.30			
1975	August	11.8	158.55	July	8.3	150.62	July	9.7	147.28	October	4.9	104.90
1976	October	8.0	171.23	July	7.1	161.27	July	5.4	155.26			
1977	October	6.6	182.53	July	7.8	173.79	July	6.7	165.70	March	28.9	135.22
1978	October	7.3	195.86	July	8.3	188.15	July	7.7	178.49			
1979	October	9.9	215.25	July	7.8	202.85	July	11.5	199.09	October	5.5	142.65
1980	October	14.3	246.03	July	9.2	221.43	July	13.0	225.05			
1981	October	11.2	273.58	July	8.8	241.02	July	10.7	249.18			
1982	October	7.4	293.82	July	7.1	258.13	July	6.3	264.79	December	15.1	164.19
1983				July	4.3	269.12	July	2.2	270.60			
1984	April	3.5	304.11	July	3.5	278.64	July	3.1	279.04	January	3.4	169.78
1985	December	3.2	313.84									
1986	December	3.1	323.57	July	2.9	286.64	July	3.8	289.56	January	3.4	175.55

¹ Hourly earnings index for private, nonfarm workers (HEI).

² Consumer price index for wage earners and clerical workers (CPI-W).

□ 1515

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS AND THE CRIME KING CONTINUES TO BE KING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ABERCROMBIE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Speaker as well as some of my colleagues who may be listed as following me that it is not my intention to utilize 1 hour. In fact, I believe that no more than 15 minutes should suffice for me to discuss the matter that impels me to seek this special order.

For about more than 2 years I have spoken out on what I generally label as "King Crime." The reason was that things happened back in the district that I felt also transgressed the purely local or parochial situation, but rather reflected a national, a greater issue that was permeating the entire Nation, and that was the insidious, pervasive presence of the most sophisticated organized crime and criminal activity, much of it, if not that which was the most powerful and richest, so sophisticated that with otherwise legitimate business fronts, very, very few, even some officers of corporations that fronted or in effect were owned by organized crime themselves were not aware first to anticipate what just in a matter of 1 year and a half became a national energy crisis. It seems to me that our communities are small, but nevertheless vital links in this chain of either strength or weakness, and as has long been said, no chain is any stronger than its weakest link and our Nation is really not that strong, but what it is brittle and susceptible to very grave social dislocations and the presence of this pervasive kind of pattern of illegality which eventually leads to such things as this out-of-control traffic in drugs, murder, homicide, prostitution, which are all tied in and are natural consequences of what we have allowed to happen in our country, and even in the case of what happened just a few years after I initiated my concerns, spoke out, at the time I spoke here on the forum, not only here but back home, I had critics who said, "What's this all about? Why do you want to importune the Congress about this?"

□ 1530

Then of course things happened in the intervening years, culminating in the attempted assassination or murder of the assistant district attorney for the Federal judicial district in western Texas, which is part and parcel of that western district that comprises my own district.

Then, following that, I spoke to the House continuously, demanding that

that attempted murder of the assistant Federal district attorney be really investigated, that the culprits and those behind them particularly be rooted out, prosecuted vigorously, and punished in accordance with the magnitude of the crime, only to find that even there I received criticism.

Then, when this same assistant Federal district attorney, who had been the object of this try, not now in that part of the county that is in my district, but which at one time was, because my district comprised the entire county, I nevertheless raised my voice, because I predicted that this was only the beginning of more serious attempts.

I felt that the issue was the intimidation of the third branch of our Government, the judiciary, at least in those areas in which the feeling was secure on the part of these powerful, powerful criminal masterminds and these criminal corporate heads of the syndicate who felt so brazen that they thought such could be done, and in fact they did.

We had a period of about 2 years in which the judiciary and all of the employees in the judiciary were in effect compelled to have U.S. marshal surveillance and custody or care or some kind of security, until I was informed on the occasion of the visit of the assistant district attorney who came, of all things, to Washington to receive a commendation from the Justice Department, and for the first time called, and I met him.

I was very much apprehensive when he said that the Federal district judge that worked mostly in that area, in the El Paso area of the western judicial district, had said that he was going to remove his U.S. marshals, and in fact had done so just a few weeks before.

I urged the district attorney to go back and plead with the judge to recall the marshals, because I felt that the threat was very present. To me it was very present. To me it was very clear. Sure enough, the very Tuesday following, on May 28, to be precise, 1979, to be exact, the judge was murdered—the first kind of crime against the judiciary of this kind in the entire history of the American judiciary.

So I then took the floor, and for 2 years, and sometimes meeting absolute obstruction, I imposed on the then President, who went so far as to send his special assistant, who brought his DEA liaison man at the White House and sat in my office and said, "Well, what is it you want?"

I said:

What do I want? It's not what I want, it's what I think we owe the American people, and that is that at least on the Federal level, you have some coordination of effort between the Federal agencies and the State and the local agencies. But I'll settle if you can just coordinate your Federal agencies.

In the meantime, another mysterious crime, which to this day has been relegated to the dust of history, took place, and that was the mysterious lingering death or coma and eventual death of the Drug Enforcement Administration man in the Mexico City bureau, who had been arrested in a San Antonio hotel for bribery under very peculiar circumstances, and then immediately transported about 80 miles north to Kerr County for security purposes until his lawyer complained that he did not have access, and they brought him back to the county jail in Bexar County, in San Antonio. He had not been there 1 day before he was given a peanut-butter-and-jelly sandwich, went into a coma, never got out of that coma, and died 6 months later. The man never had a chance to have his day in court on any kind of an accusation.

Nevertheless, the case was closed as if he had been guilty.

Who would think that one would choke up on a peanut-butter-and-jelly sandwich and go into a coma and die 6 months later, that that was strictly a normal, natural occurrence. Well, if anybody believes that, of course, they are ready to believe in the tooth fairy.

The reason that I am bringing this up is that after speaking for 2 years, finally, to me the biggest satisfaction was having 1 day, a Friday, in my hometown, in my home, a phone call from Washington from the Director of the FBI, Mr. Webster, who said:

We're calling you because we give you credit, more than anybody else, for having helped us at least resolve this, and we're giving you a little advance information that in about 4 hours, we will announce the first indictments in this case. I am happy about all of that.

I then, after that, did not speak out.

I now speak because, rather than having closed out this case, the fact remains that to me it still remains very much unsolved. I must also remind everybody interested that the attack and the attempted killing of the assistant Federal district attorney has not been resolved. However, there is no question about it, it was connected.

Then we had the trial of some of those that were indicted. However, I am firm in my opinion that those above those that were apprehended—the hit man was finally flushed out—but those who made the contract with the hit man were in my opinion middle. There are higher and more powerful forces behind.

What was the issue? The issue was what I had anticipated in going before the grand jury and speaking out in the local press about the existence of the opening of what became known later as the brown heroin trade. When the French Connection was closed, much due to the efforts of Santa Barrio, the DEA agent that died as I said after a coma, after eating a peanut-butter-

and-jelly sandwich, which I think ought to disturb all mothers who are accustomed to giving that to their children—it is their usual fare—that we better look out here and see, maybe we should have some nutrition expert investigate all of this.

Nevertheless, the point remains that a pattern has continued. The bombing, for instance, or the blowing up of an automobile belonging to a colleague of mine not too far from the area in which I reside naturally was a matter of concern. This followed not too long after the FBI had reported a contract on my life for \$35,000, and then refused to give me a report.

I had to go through the Freedom of Information in order to glean something, and discovered to my amazement that not only had that been one time, the one that I was asking information about, but that the FBI had knowledge of three prior threats that had been made but never once had been reported to me.

□ 1540

And what is more important, they had a most interesting dossier ever since I had been in the State senate. So when the bombing of this Congressman, a colleague of ours from Texas who does not represent a district in the immediate vicinity of mine, but the bombing having taken place right in the heart of my district, I naturally made sure that there would be some Federal presence, and I requested the San Antonio Police Department, at that time the head of the homicide division, who had been a long-time friend, our friendship going back to when he started his career and I was the chief juvenile probation officer for Bexar County, so that when some officers and some administrators and some people say, "Well, what is your source of information," well it goes back to the day that I was in law enforcement, and that is part and parcel of it.

In the case of this gentleman who headed the division on homicide and who has since retired, I ask him to please make sure that the Federal agents and agencies who have a presence under the responsibility of the code, as amended by title 18. However, that case disappeared into the dust of history, but it did not from my mind.

Then comes the incident just a few weeks ago in which a very bizarre homicide was recorded, one San Antonio policeman killing another policeman and the circumstances surrounding. So I then wrote Director William Webster a request that he please have the Federal Bureau of Investigation look into the circumstances surrounding this pattern of behavior because I felt that constituents who belonged to a certain segment of my society had been exposed by the actions of this

particular police officer and some in his association.

I will place in the RECORD the letter that I received in reply to my request. My letter was dated September 4 and the letter dated September 24 which I received day before yesterday by way of reply from Director Webster, and also my reply to this letter as of October 9, yesterday, to Director Webster. The letters referred to follow:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, DC, September 24, 1986.

Hon. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GONZALEZ: I have received your letter of September 4th expressing your concern regarding recent incidents involving officers of the San Antonio Police Department and requesting an FBI investigation. We are currently looking into the matter involving the shooting of Officer Stephen Smith. In view of your knowledge and interest, we believe it would be beneficial for FBI representatives to discuss with you the shooting incident and the other matters you mentioned. I understand my colleagues in San Antonio have been in contact with your local office regarding such a meeting, and I hope your schedule will permit you to meet with our representatives at the earliest possible date. I can assure you that we will diligently follow up on any information which would indicate a possible violation of Federal law falling within our investigative jurisdiction.

Thank you for your interest and for advising me of your concerns.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. WEBSTER,
Director.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 9, 1986.

Hon. WILLIAM H. WEBSTER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR WEBSTER: I am glad to know that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is "looking into" the matters raised in my letter to you dated September 4. However, my concern is not much assured for I do not have the sense that the Bureau has given this inquiry the status or urgency it deserves. Clearly the conduct of Officer Stephen Smith most probably violated the rights of a large number of individuals. It seems likely that this conduct was known by others and had been known for some time. Yet as far as I can ascertain there is no effort to investigate the very broad and grave implications raised by Officer Smith's strange death, let alone the questions that arise by the appearance that his activities were known but left undisciplined.

My staff did of course advise me of the request your representatives made for a meeting. Aside from the fact that my schedule does not now permit me the time to arrange such a meeting, I do not feel it would be productive. I am asking the Bureau to use its resources to investigate fully circumstances that suggest substantial problems in a major police department. I do not have access to the information and resources that you do. If I do acquire any data that might be useful I will immediately convey it to you. My request was, and I reiterate it, for the Bureau to investigate the incident and its implications, so that the integrity of the San Antonio Police Department can be as-

sured and the people of the city may have confidence in the professionalism, efficiency and conduct of their police.

With every good wish, I am
Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

Mr. GONZALEZ. The point is that what we have reached is a point in our history that I think is more troublesome than perhaps any other, and that is where a sophisticated, highly organized crime has been able to gather such power that it has even greater power than our duly constituted law enforcement agents because they have infiltrated our Government, they have infiltrated our political system, they have infiltrated and now have substantial interests in business that otherwise has very honorable fronts. With this kind of combination, how can we ask a poor policeman, how can we ask even an FBI agent? This is the reason why in our society we can have such a thing as the disappearance and the presumable homicide or death of such a person as Jimmy Hoffa who still is a sort of a mystery, and the reason is that Jimmy Hoffa was involved in the highest, the intricacies of involvement not only with organized crime of the highest type but with political forces in our Government and political parties, and because even our President does not escape the shadow of suspicion because the first \$4 million that President Reagan made in Hollywood were the result of moneys that enabled him to be received by a going concern in Hollywood that was heavily infiltrated by organized crime. It has always been a well-established fact that Hollywood generally has had an unwholesome pervasive presence of organized crime.

So what I am saying is that I hope that we can have the kind of backing of our law enforcement agents that can help us in the communities that do not have the resources to have a comprehensive look into and safeguarding against these very, very powerful forces that operate intrastate, interstate, and internationally against which a poor local municipal police force does not have a chance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PARTNERS IN PREVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ABERCROMBIE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, drug abuse and its prevention are uppermost in the mind of much of America today. I rise today to speak about a drug prevention program in my district known as PIP-fests; Partners in Prevention Festivals. This program started in 1981 as an outgrowth of the

Partner's Institute at the University of Minnesota Duluth, and funded through a grant awarded by the U.S. National Institute of Drug Abuse. The first program was held in Little Falls, MN, and is on going at the present time. In 1982, a corporation called PIP-Fest International was formed and today that organization does its business as Partners In Prevention. The leaders locally are volunteers.

Partners in Prevention is an experienced group of professionals providing programs, directed at adolescents and adults, that offer schools, communities, businesses and service organizations a proven, cost- and time-effective method which presents alternatives to drug abuse through the promotion of emotional and physical health. Partners in Prevention is a primary prevention organization providing high school students and concerned adults with an experience that helps them better understand themselves and others, improve their communication skills, and raise their self-esteem. This helps to minimize the abuse to drugs as well as enhance already present leadership skills. Those attending the PIP-festivals programs will have the opportunity to become life-long partners with chemical abuse prevention and healthy living.

Partners in Prevention is currently experiencing its 6th consecutive year of growth and expansion. There are 20 high school PIP-festivals targeted for this school year and new programs are currently being written and developed for high school athletes, for adults and for families. There is a continuing need for extending the network of people who are interested in preventing chemical abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it's important to note that this program is one that is generated by public involvement and concern about the drug problem facing our Nation. All the money in the world won't solve the drug problem unless the public at large is educated and takes part in rejecting this menace from our streets and neighborhoods forever. Partners in Prevention is a program which reaches our children in every segment of our society. It encourages parents and their children to fight against drugs by developing a lifestyle that raises one's self-esteem, confidence and leadership skills.

Partners in Prevention stresses beating drug use to the punch. By its very name PIP attempts to prevent drug abuse before it becomes a problem. As any expert in the field of drug abuse can tell you prevention is not only the best way in dealing with the drug problem at large, but it is also the most cost effective. Prevention also eliminates the side effects to drug abuse such as violent crime, runaways and broken families, not to mention

the broken dreams of the parents and friends of the drug abuser.

The idea of combining the family element into this program reaches deep to the core of what America is all about. Taking care of one's family should be, and is the No. 1 priority for each and everyone of us. PIP does just that by opening up the lines of communication between parents and their children. Mr. Speaker, how many times have we heard it said by drug users: " * * * if somebody had just told me they cared. * * * " With this program parents and children learn how to express their feelings in a way that enables both parties involved to show that they care.

Mr. Speaker, Partners in Prevention is a program that has worked. For 6 years it has been preventing drug abuse and contributing to the lives of hundreds of people who want to say no to drugs. I urge my fellow colleagues to encourage the development of similar programs in their own States if they don't already exist.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the record the full text of a letter I received from the vice president of Partners in Prevention, Mr. Dave Sjoblad, in case other Members would like to contact him and find out more on just how their program works.

Members may also contact my office for more information as well.

The letter referred to follows:

PARTNERS IN PREVENTION,
Little Falls, MN, September 2, 1986.
Hon. ARLAN STANGELAND,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C. 20515

DEAR MR. STANGELAND: Thank you again for visiting us at Partners In Prevention. We appreciate your time and the support you showed for our program. We are especially pleased that you agreed to read us into the Congressional Record. Enclosed you will find the document which we would like you to read. If there are any questions or suggestions you may have, please feel free to contact our office.

Good luck in the coming election.

Sincerely,

Dave Sjoblad, Vice President.

PARTNERS IN PREVENTION

PIP-Fests, Partners In Prevention-Festivals, started in 1981 as an outgrowth of the Partner's Institute at the University of Minnesota Duluth, and through a grant awarded by the United States National Institute of Drug Abuse. The first program was held in Little Falls, Minnesota. In 1982, a corporation called PIP-Fest International, Inc. was formed and today that organization does its business as Partners In Prevention.

Partners in Prevention is an experienced group of professionals providing programs, directed at adolescents and adults, that offer schools, communities, businesses and service organizations a proven, cost- and time-effective method which presents alternatives to drug abuse through the promotion of emotional and physical health. Partners in Prevention is a primary prevention organization providing high school students and concerned adults with an experience that helps them better understand them-

selves and others, improve their communication skills, and raise their self-esteem. This helps to minimize the abuse of drugs as well as enhance already present leadership skills. Those attending the PIP-Fest programs will have the opportunity to become life-long partners with chemical abuse prevention and healthy living.

A PIP-Fest is a weekend retreat filled with activities whose primary goal is to prevent chemical abuse among adolescents. In large group settings, students and adults are provided with information about building relationships, healthy ways of dealing with feelings, chemical dependency as a family disease, the art of listening and helping others solve problems, maintaining self-esteem and chemical abuse prevention. In small groups, they have an opportunity to personalize the large group presentations and to practice communications skills. The PIP-Fest weekend is a time for students and adults to learn more about themselves, to learn how to show care and support for others and to learn new ways to have fun without using chemicals.

In the past five years there have been over 60 PIP-Fests in four States and one Canadian Province. Almost 10 thousand high school adolescents have attended. The program has proven to be an effective one. By addressing the issues of awareness, self-esteem and alternatives to chemical use, many young people and adults have been given the power to say "no" to drugs.

Partners in Prevention is currently experiencing its sixth consecutive year of growth and expansion. There are 20 high school PIP-Fests targeted for this school year and new programs are currently being written and developed for high school athletes, for adults and for families. There is a continuing need for extending the network of people who are interested in preventing chemical abuse. Partners in Prevention can be contacted by writing to P.O. Box 43, Little Falls, MN 56345. Telephone 612-632-2165.

□ 1550

PROTECTING THE AMERICAN CONSUMER AND MANUFACTURER AGAINST FAULTY FOREIGN-MADE GOODS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to require the posting of a surety bond with respect to products manufactured in foreign countries or customs unions. This legislation is an effort to give the American consumer and manufacturer protection against fraudulent, shoddy, or—possibly—dangerous products produced and imported from abroad.

At the present time, there is no legal recourse against bad performance for the consumer of foreign products whether the item is a component part of a computer or an airplane engine or whether it is a chain saw sold directly through our retail outlets to the public.

There is a tremendous liability involved here which is going uncovered.

Our domestic manufacturers are being hammered into the ground on the costs of product liability. In this litigious society—which is modern America—the necessity for liability insurance is a given and built in additional cost for all American products.

We are told that in order for our American products to compete against foreign products inside our own markets, they must be competitively priced. The cost of protecting the American public by providing liability coverage is carried by only the manufacturers of "made in America."

This is not fair to American producers, Mr. Speaker, but more than that, it is not fair to the American consumer.

Increasingly we are seeing counterfeit products coming in from abroad. For a long time we have heard of fraudulent fashion items such as handbags, clothing, perfumes, and trendy watches. But, now the stories are becoming grimmer. We are hearing about fraudulent bolts and screws—industrial fasteners—which have found their way into nuclear powerplants, helicopters, and defense systems.

The extent of this inundation is so great that the question of quality control becomes moot. In one operation dealing with the Space Program, the engineer in charge of quality control examined eight bins of size 8 bolts with the correct markings for heat tolerance. Selecting one bolt, at random, from each bin, he tested for accuracy of the markings.

All eight were counterfeits. All had come from the Philadelphia Disc Supply Depot which feeds our total defense industrial base effort.

Good quality control would mandate throwing the bad fasteners out, but we have gotten ourselves into the situation that at this point in time, the counterfeits are such a great part of our internal supplies, that the bad bolts would only be replaced by more fraudulent bolts.

What is happening in the civilian sector we can only speculate. But, if it is anything like what is happening in the defense sector, we certainly need some kind of legislation which will make the guilty parties liable for their fraud.

American insurers and manufacturers should not be responsible for accidents caused by counterfeit component parts buried in the depths of some malfunctioning engine of an airplane or bus. The way our system of international justice works right now, the liability would fall totally on the American producer because he is the only one covered by liability which can be reached by our court system.

My legislation, originally cosponsored by Mr. MURTHA of Pennsylvania; from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. OAKAR; from West Virginia, Mr. RAHALL; from Connecticut, Mrs.

JOHNSON; from Pennsylvania, Mr. CLINGER; and from Maryland, Mrs. BYRON and Mr. DYSON would create a surety bond equal to 20 percent of the value of all the products imported from that producer.

This would serve to establish the validity of the foreign manufacturer and in case of bad performance or fraudulent representation, create a pool of money against which recovery of loss or damages can be made.

This legislation, I would hope, should begin to shake out the fraudulent manufacturers right away. Fly-by-night importers or producers would not be likely to post a bond for what would be tantamount to immediate forfeiture.

As we moved into the global economy at the beginning of this decade, many of the standards of U.S. manufacturing—which had grown up through years of American industrialization—were taken for granted. In opening up our market to foreign products, we forgot that U.S. law for years had been policing us through liability legislation into standardization of quality.

If shoddy or dangerous products were produced, the U.S. justice system allowed the consumer to "get at" the guilty producer.

I would judge that now over 50 percent of what we are purchasing is outside of that system of justice. The global village needs some way of holding accountable those international manufacturers and importers who operate not only outside of the moral law, but operate outside of U.S. jurisdictional law.

I hope we have found the way. I also hope that many of my colleagues will come aboard along with me and the several original cosponsors of this legislation. We think it is an idea whose time has come.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE CHARLES O. WHITLEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. CHARLES O. WHITLEY:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 7, 1986.
Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the 99th Congress representing the Third Congressional District of the State of North Carolina to be effective at midnight, December 31, 1986.

This letter is being executed in triplicate originals with one being directed to you; one to the Governor of North Carolina; and one to the Sergeant at Arms of the United States House of Representatives.

Please advise if any additional action is required on my part to effectuate the official

termination of my status as a United States Representative at the time specified herein.
Respectfully,

CHARLES O. WHITLEY,
Member of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TRAXLER (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of a necessary absence.

Mr. RAHALL (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON, for 60 minutes, on October 15.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DELAY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEACH of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LELAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DICKS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BYRON, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DELAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. FRENZEL in five instances.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. McCANDLESS.

Mr. GEKAS in two instances.

Mr. BEREUTER in two instances.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. STUMP.

Mr. DIOGUARDI.

Mr. MCKERNAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ENGLISH.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. LaFALCE.
Mr. MARKEY.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. LELAND.
Mr. KILDEE in two instances.
Mr. FRANK.
Mr. MURTHA.
Mr. COELHO.
Mr. WYDEN.
Mr. LEHMAN of California.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
Mr. RAY.
Mr. GARCIA.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 786. An act to establish an Information Age Commission; to the Committees on Government Operations and Science and Technology.

S. 1209. An act to establish the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 2055. An act to establish the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

S. 2370. An act to authorize the Francis Scott Key Park Foundation, Inc. to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 2452. An act to designate the U.S. Post Office to be constructed in Barnwell, SC, as the "Solomon Blatt, Sr., Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to designate March 17, 1987, as "National China-Burma-India Veterans Association Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 407. Joint resolution designating November 12, 1986, as "Salute to School Volunteers Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1598. An act for the relief of Steven McKenna;

H.R. 2182. An act to authorize the inclusion of certain additional lands within the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore;

H.R. 2224. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nonimmigrant alien crewmen on fishing vessels to stop temporarily at ports in Guam;

H.R. 4212. An act to provide for the reauthorization of the Deep Seabed Hard Mineral Resources Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5016. An act for the relief of Sueng Ho Jang and Sueng Il Jang;

H.R. 5073. An act to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to require the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate regulations requiring inspection for asbestos-containing material in the Nation's

schools, development of asbestos management plans for such schools, response actions with respect to friable asbestos-containing material in such schools, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to consent to an amendment enacted by the legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920;

H.J. Res. 438. Joint resolution to designate October 31, 1986, as "National Child Identification and Safety Information Day";

H.J. Res. 517. Joint resolution providing for reappointment of David C. Acheson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

H.J. Res. 666. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress in support of a commemorative structure within the National Park System dedicated to the promotion of understanding, knowledge, opportunity and equality for all people.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 816. An act to establish the Pine Ridge National Recreation Area and Soldier Creek Wilderness in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes, and

S. 2048. An act to encourage international efforts to designate the shipwreck of the R.M.S. *Titanic* as an international maritime memorial and to provide for reasonable research, exploration, and, if appropriate, salvage activities with respect to the shipwreck.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 14, 1986, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4327. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 99-278); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4328. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting a notice of meetings related to the International Energy Program to be held on October 14, 1986, at the offices of UNESCO, Paris, France; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4329. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1985 report on the state of domestic mining, minerals, and mineral reclamation industries, including a statement of the trend in utilization and depletion of these resources, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 21a; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FUQUA: Committee on Science and Technology. Report on the traffic alert and collision avoidance system: a technological contribution to air safety (Rept. 99-987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 586. Resolution providing for disagreeing to the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 668 (Rept. 99-988). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 587. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the conference report on H.R. 6 and against the consideration of such conference (Rept. 99-989). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 588. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the conference report on S. 1128 a bill to amend the Clean Water Act, and against the consideration of such conference report (Rept. 99-990). Referred to the House Calendar.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 5406. The Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5406; H.R. 5406 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 5690. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act to authorize grants to States for demonstration projects that provide to older individuals services in return for certain volunteer services provided to other individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 5691. A bill to establish a preference for nondevelopment items in nondefense Government procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. YATES, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. WALDON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. EVANS of Illinois):

H.R. 5692. A bill to amend chapter XIV of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984, relating to victims of crime, to provide funds to encourage States to implement protective reforms regarding the investiga-

tion and adjudication of child sex abuse cases which minimize the additional trauma to the child victim and improve the chances of successful criminal prosecution or legal action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 5693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore prior law for purposes of claiming a dependency exemption where, under a pre-1985 instrument, the noncustodial parent provides \$1,200 or more for the support of a child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. DICKS):

H.R. 5694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a charitable contribution deduction for certain amounts paid to or for the benefit of an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 5695. A bill to assure the appropriate and safe use of artificially produced growth hormones; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. LEACH of Iowa):

H. Con. Res. 409. Concurrent resolution expressing the support of Congress for the petition drive of the National Forum requesting a televised educational forum on nuclear arms issues; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 584. Resolution electing Representative HILLIS of Indiana to the Committee on Armed Services; and Representative DORNAN of California to the Committee on Education and Labor; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. OAKAR:

H. Res. 585. Resolution designating membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 442: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 3842: Mr. COURTER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. CARR, and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 4025: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 5067: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 5272: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 5512: Mr. TORRICELLI and Mr. RUSSO.

H.R. 5535: Mr. McEWEN, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 5587: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 5588: Mr. HAYES, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. FROST, and Mr. WEBER.

H.R. 5596: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 5603: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 5604: Mrs. HOLT, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MONSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. SHELBY.

H.R. 5618: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 5683: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. KEMP, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. GREGG, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAUB, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. HENRY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CARR, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. WEBER, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LOTT, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LENT, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr.

HUNTER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. DARDEN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MICA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LUKE, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. APPLE-GATE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GOODLING, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. STRANG, Mr. RITTER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. McDADE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

H.J. Res. 244: Mr. WIRTH and Mr. IRELAND.

H.J. Res. 681: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. STRATTON.

H.J. Res. 693: Mr. VENTO, Mr. MICA, Mr. HENDON, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.J. Res. 706: Mr. FRENZEL.

H.J. Res. 740: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MOODY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DeLAY, and Mr. RALPH M. HALL.

H.J. Res. 745: Mrs. BOGGS.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. KASICH, Mr. BOLAND, and Mr. MATSUI.

H. Con. Res. 407: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. WALDON, and Mr. SAXTON.

H. Res. 488: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. HUGHES.

H. Res. 566: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H. Res. 573: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. CHAFFIE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. FISH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MOLINARI, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H. Res. 581: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LUNDINE, and Mr. HAYES.